COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. VI. NO. I.

FEBRUARY, 1886.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1886.

INDEX TO VOLUME VI.

No. I.

Page.

Lutheran Union, by Prof. M. Loy 1
The two Testaments in the one Revelation, by G. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 19
Paper Resolutions, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 32
The Treatment of the Oath in the Sermon, in Catechisation, etc., by Prof. A. Pflueger 47

No. II.

The Genesis of Faith, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 65
Lutheran Union, by Prof. M. Loy 89
The Treatment of the Oath in the Sermon, in Catechisation, etc., by Prof. A. Pflueger 106
Paradise found at last, by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn 115

No. III.

The Gift of Tongues, by Prof. Theo. Mees 129
The Genesis of Faith, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 147
The New Theory of the Old Testament, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 167
Luther on Questions of Divorce, Translated by Rev. J. A. Schulze 178

No. IV.

Lutheran Union, by Prof. M. Loy 193
The Office of Faith, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 217
Environment and Character, by Rev. E. Pfeifer 231
What the Roman Catholics want, by Prof. A. Pflueger 249

No. V.

What the Roman Catholics want, by Prof. A. Pflueger 257
The Constitution of Synods, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 267
Christmas and Easter Scenes in Jerusalem, Translated by Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 291
The Age of Man Geologically Considered, by S. R. Pattison, Esq., F. G. S. 302

No. VI.

The Mystery in Conversion, by Prof. M. Loy 321
Concerning Articles of Faith, by Prof. G. H. Schodde 349
Labor in the Light of the Bible, by Prof. Theo. Mees 372

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VI. FEBRUARY, 1886. No. 1.

LUTHERAN UNION.

That divisions among those pursuing the same ends result in a waste of energies is a dictate as well of reason as of the Word of God. "In union there is strength" is one of those proverbial expressions in which the common sense of mankind has found utterance; "every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand," says our blessed Lord. We therefore recognize it as one of the interests of the Lutheran Church to which our MAGAZINE is devoted to promote the union of her members in the great work to which she is called. Nor is this in any sense a conviction of but recent growth in our minds. While others have been imputing to us the most narrow exclusiveness and hostility to all movements looking towards the union of Lutherans, we have for years and years been laboring, perhaps more earnestly and persistently than most of those who brought such railing accusations against us, to attain the end so much to be desired.

Such union does not necessarily imply the association of all Lutherans in one external organization under one general government. That is a question of expediency. The Scriptural unit is the local congregation, to which all

church power is committed; what lies beyond that in the sphere of organization will depend upon the decision of those possessing such power under the divine charter. A number of congregations do not become one church in virtue of their association in a synod, or of synods in a larger and more general organization, but are one in virtue of their acceptance and confession of the same faith. "Unto the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies instituted by men should be alike everywhere; as St. Paul says, 'There is one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.' Eph. 4, 4. 5." *Augsb. Conf.* Art. VII.

But every reader feels that this does not fully meet the exigencies of the case as it presents itself to the view of Lutherans in this country. It lays down a principle which must be accepted as a condition of all church union. Unity of faith must precede united effort and fraternal co-operation. But this latter must not on that account be ignored or treated with indifference. The history of the Lutheran Church in this widely extended land has been such as to lead to manifold complications. Some organizations started well, but gradually deteriorated; some started ill, but gradually improved. Some individuals and some congregations became better, some became worse than the organizations with which they were associated. In extending their work, some organizations occupied the territory upon which others were already laboring, sometimes without inquiring into the character of the churches which they found in the field, sometimes with the vague notion that any church has a divine right to organize congregations wherever it can

gather members, sometimes with the consciousness that there were such differences as would warrant division, sometimes with a zeal for synodical aggrandizement that wantonly disregarded all church rights. The result has been a state of things that is not a little perplexing. Instances occur in which there are as many as four pastors and congregations claiming to be Lutherans, though none recognizing each other and all working against each other, occupying a small field which could be amply cultivated by one. In hundreds of localities there are such rivalries and jealousies, with all the waste of strength and perpetration of wrong which this implies, between "Lutherans of different sorts." The evil is without controversy great. But judicious minds will take into account the circumstances of our history, and will therefore not be ready, though the wrong in many instances is crying, to denounce the whole situation as hopeless and to seek a remedy only in ignoring and rejecting whatever is faulty and seeking to build up, in opposition to it, congregations of the right faith and practice. What can be saved must not be cast away. "Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it."

We do not mean that every congregation calling itself Lutheran must be recognized as such, in spite of its plain confession, by word or deed, that its name is a manifest misnomer. Nor do we mean that we should refuse to organize or accept congregations in places where there are already some that call themselves Lutheran. The name is so much abused that its application forms but a slight presumption that what is so named is so in fact. Least of all do we mean that we should quit the field when others are occupying it. Our concern for the glory of God and the salvation of sinners would forbid that, however strongly

our carnal feelings might urge it. What we do mean is that men who see the wrong should make efforts to right it. If there is any way to prevent the wasting of energies and to increase the influence of the Lutheran Church by uniting her forces, that way should be sought. We are not willing to accept as a foregone conclusion that there are no Lutherans in any of the organizations with which we have thus far not been able to unite. Even in the General Synod which, notwithstanding the steps which it has taken in the right direction, is still so far from a sound Lutheran basis, and in the Missouri Synod, which once ran so well, but has fallen so sadly, there may be some who would accept the Lutheran faith and agree to the adoption of the practice which that necessarily involves. At any rate, where there is reason to hope that we might come to some understanding which would diminish our disabilities, as there certainly is reason to hope with regard to some pastors and congregations and synods, every righteous effort should be made to accomplish that end. We do not mean, in short, to advocate a union without regard to the will of the Master, but would labor zealously to ascertain His will in this respect as well as in others, and do what lies in our power towards realizing it in the communion of saints. To this end our present essay is directed.

I. In the first place, we presume that all who put forth any reasonable claim to be called Lutherans will admit the acceptance of the canonical books of the Old and New Testament as the Word of God, and therefore as absolute and exclusive authority in the Church, to be a fundamental condition of union. Those who will not unite with us on that basis may, though they should persist in calling themselves Christians, or even Lutherans, be considered as placing themselves beyond the scope of our inquiry.

But whilst this may be regarded as formally accepted by all contemplated in our theme, there are some implications which it seems to us necessary to unfold and elucidate.

1. The first point is one which, were it not that the thoughts of so many, when the question of union is considered, are governed so largely by natural sentiment and reason, it might seem superfluous to mention. It is this, that as the Christian Church is a divine institution and there is a King in Zion, not the will of man, but the will of the Lord must determine the conditions under which members may be received and congregations and synods may be recognized as brethren. "Be not ye called Rabbi; for One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth; for One is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters; for One is your Master, even Christ." Matt. 23, 8–10. It is therefore disloyalty to the Lord of all for any man or any body of men to arrogate the power of decreeing what shall entitle a person to membership in the Christian Church. That is the Lord's prerogative. He is the King, who alone lays down laws for the establishment and government of His kingdom; the citizens are all brethren, who are all equal, and none of whom is to lord it over God's heritage. "Christ is the Head of the Church, and He is the Savior of the body. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything." Eph. 5, 23. 24. God "hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all." Eph. 1, 22. 23.

The will of the Lord is made known in the Holy Scriptures. All lists of membership must therefore be drawn

from that inspired source. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 16. 17. That contains all that is necessary. It is the unerring guide of God's people. Beyond that they need not go. Beyond that they must not go; for all else is human and without authority—all else is fallible and delusive. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8, 20. Those who are sincere in their devotion to the Lord will hear His voice, and will not hear the voice of strangers. "If ye continue in my word," says the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, "then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8, 31. 32. Therefore the holy apostle says: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom." Col. 3, 16.

This principle is always sinned against when congregations and larger organizations of professing Christians claim the right to erect any platform that may seem to them expedient and exclude all from the church who for any reason are unable to stand upon it. Secular associations may adopt whatever basis of union seems good in their eyes. Man may organize societies for any purpose that commends itself to their judgment, and may adopt any articles of agreement that in their view will best secure their object. Their own judgment must in such matters be their guide. But let not such societies usurp the prerogatives of the Lord and call themselves churches of the living God. As human organizations they may, as long as they do not violate the laws of the land and subvert the civil government, be tolerated;

but as soon as they claim to be the kingdom of God, whether formally by calling themselves a Christian Church, or materially by claiming to accomplish what the Christian Church with its Word and Sacrament alone can accomplish, they should find in every Christian a determined antagonist. Any denomination that sets up tests of membership which it admits to transcend the requirements of the Holy Scriptures, but which it defends as necessary for the attainment of its peculiar denominational ends, stands confessed a miserable sect, if not a synagogue of Satan. It has set itself against the King whilst claiming to be a part of His kingdom. It has declared the Lord's will and word to be insufficient for the accomplishment of the purposes for which His Church was established, and hoists the flag of rebellion against the King, whom it has blasphemously pronounced incompetent to govern His kingdom. With such, on their basis, we can form no union, although so far as charity may assume that, following the ways of the world, they have thoughtlessly, without any conscious intent to undermine the Lord's authority and the divine foundation of the Church, fallen into their destructive error, we may treat with them in the hope of inducing them to abandon their ruinous principle, as long as they do not themselves deprive us of all reasonable ground for such hope. The inconsistency of accepting the Word of God as absolute and exclusive authority in the Church, and yet of assuming authority to lay down conditions of membership which that Word confessedly does not recognize as such is so glaring that it would be uncharitable to assume all effort to be useless, which might be put forth with a view of correcting the evil.

2. Our principle implies, in the second place, that all remnants of Romish views in this regard be abandoned.

This requires, first, the rejection of all claims to lordship in the Church by any creature, whether called pope or otherwise and on whatever plea asserted, and the recognition of Christ alone as Lord. As the Lutheran Reformation was characterized by unrelenting war against the papal Antichrist, it may be presumed that no adherent of popery would claim the Lutheran name, or desire to be included in a Lutheran union. But the popish principle has by no means lost all influence in Protestant minds, and even among those calling themselves Lutherans, it is possible to find papal power conceded to some sinful man, though the man of sin at Rome be renounced. When it is maintained, for instance, that the laity, being unlearned and incapable of judging doctrine, are bound to accept as articles of faith whatever the pastor of the congregation or the highest official in synod may think it proper to impose as such, a principle which has been the curse of Romanism is admitted, and must, although in the beginning the usurped divine authority may be used with discretion and by some even with scrupulous fidelity to the Scriptures, in the end work out the same disastrous results which it exhibits in Romanism.

It requires, secondly, the rejection of all apocryphal Scriptures as authority in matters of faith. Lutherans do not object to the reading for instruction and edification of the uninspired books appended to the Old Testament. They do not object to publishing them in editions of the Bible to be circulated among the people. These books may even be appealed to in confirmation of divine truth derived from the Scriptures which are given by inspiration of God. The largest liberty may be allowed in this respect. But when it is maintained, as is done by Romanists, that they are of

equal authority with the canonical books of the Bible, and that therefore articles of faith may be drawn from them as well as from the inspired Scriptures, our principle is subverted and agreement is impossible. The history of Romanism has shown what grievous errors may be imposed upon the people on the authority of these spurious writings, and even if the assurance were given that the maintenance of such errors is not the motive for claiming the equal authority of the apocryphal with the canonical books of Holy Scripture, the claim could not be admitted without breaking down our safeguards against heresy.

It requires, thirdly, that tradition shall not be accepted as a source or norm of Christian faith and doctrine. How traditions have formed a convenient refuge of lies in the Romish church is well known. In the days of the Reformation it was remarked how Papists escaped from the conclusive evidence of Scripture by appeals to an alleged Word of God that was handed down from the earliest ages of the Church without having been recorded by the holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Such theories may not be maintained in their Romish form by men in our day who choose to call themselves Lutherans. But the leaven of Romanism has not ceased to work, and our safety lies only in excluding it. When, for example, appeals are taken from the plain sense of Scripture to a form of doctrine alleged to be historically traceable to the days of the apostles, or when the refusal to submit to a burden imposed upon the conscience without scriptural warrant is met by the claim that the existence of such a custom in the Church for centuries gives it divine authority, the validity of the procedure cannot be admitted without undermining the exclusive authority of the Scriptures. People should be taught

to respect history and established usages, and to make the best possible use of them for understanding the Bible and edifying the Church, but the admission of any other principle and rule of faith than that of God's Word, given in the writings of the apostles and prophets, subverts divine authority and undermines human certitude and assurance.

It requires, fourthly, that no divine authority should be attached to the decrees of councils or resolutions of synods. The theory in vogue among the Romanists, that the Holy Ghost is present in the Church in such wise as to reveal the holy will of God as occasion may require, and that the decrees of councils are such revelations, which are therefore of equal authority with the revelation recorded in Holy Scripture, is formally rejected by many who nevertheless virtually accept it. How otherwise could they maintain, for instance, that when a synod agrees to teach any given doctrine or to engage in any given work, the people are, for that very reason, bound in conscience to believe the doctrine or execute the work? That the representatives of churches agree on any proposition is unquestionably an evidence in its favor, and when there is no reason in conscience for opposing what has thus been carefully considered and agreed upon it should be accepted. But that does not preclude all question as to its truth and righteousness. Synods may err as well as the single individuals who constitute them, and every Christian must retain the right of trying their decisions by the only rule of faith and life. Never could Lutherans agree to accept as divinely authoritative, and therefore as binding for the conscience, whatever synods may choose to decree, whether such decrees abide the test of Holy Scripture or not. God, not man, must decide what is of divine authority, and that decision is given alone in the canonical books of the Bible.

It requires, finally, that the teachings of the Fathers, whether this mean those of the ancient Church or those of the Reformation, shall not be decisive for the individual conscience. It is not our purpose to point out the sophisms and subterfuges to which Romanists have been driven in their efforts to uphold the theory, that the common consent of ancient writers furnishes a ground of faith. We assume that those who sincerly desire the union of Lutherans are not consciously in sympathy with Rome in regard to the fundamental principle under consideration. But when, instead of adhering strictly to the Scriptures and abiding by its "Thus saith the Lord," arguments are drawn from the ancient writers of the Church, or from those palmy days in which the Gospel was again set forth in its purity by Luther and his coadjutors, as if the fact that men taught a certain doctrine in those olden times rendered it divinely authoritative, a principle is practically accepted which Lutherans are not willing to accept, and which would only lead to strife and dissensions, instead of harmony and union. People should be taught to reverence the fathers, and their agreement, so far as that can be shown, is doubtless a presumptive proof for the correctness of the position thus confirmed. But whether that, for the establishment of which the proof is adduced, is really obligatory upon the conscience, is not decided by the fact of their teaching it, but simply and solely by the evidence of Holy Scriptures.

3. Our principle implies, in the third place, that those notions respecting the Word of God which are peculiar to Reformed parties, as against the Lutherans, be not admitted.

Among these we reckon, first, the fanatical theories of a special revelation aside from the Word of God given in

Holy Scripture. Whatever form this error may assume, whether that of an illumination by the Holy Spirit in connection with the Word wherever it may please Him to give it, so that the Scriptures are in themselves a dead letter which becomes living truth only in special cases, according to the usual doctrine of Reformed parties, or that of an illumination in entire independence of the Word, so that the Scriptures are not necessary for the communication of the truth, according to the doctrine of the Quakers and similar enthusiasts, it is one that practically sets aside the true source and rule of faith, and deprives God's people of the only criterion by which they can try the prophets and be rectified of heavenly truth. Lutherans could never agree to place human dreams on an equality with divine revelation. "In those things which concern the spoken, outward Word, we must firmly hold that God grants His Spirit or grace to no one except through or with the preceding outward Word. Thereby we are protected against enthusiasts, i. e. the spirits who boast that they have the Spirit without and before the Word, and accordingly judge Scripture or the spoken Word and explain and stretch it at their pleasure, as Muenzer did, and many still do at the present day; they wish to be acute judges between the Spirit and the letter, and yet know not what they say or propose. Because the papacy also is nothing but enthusiasm, by which the pope boasts that all laws exist in the shrine of his heart, and whatever he decides and commends in his churches is spirit and law, even though it be above and contrary to Scripture and the spoken Word. All this is the old devil and old serpent, who also converted Adam and Eve into enthusiasts, and led them from the outward Word of God to spiritualism and self-conceit, and neverthe-

less he effected this through other outward words. Just so our enthusiasts at the present day condemn the outward Word, and nevertheless they themselves are not silent, but they fill the world with their preachings and writings, as though indeed the Spirit were unable to come through the writings and spoken word of apostles, but he must come through their writings and words." *Smalc. Art.* III. Art. 10, 3–6. The acceptance of such a fanatical theory would be a bar to union, not only because, as Scripture and reason and history teach, wild whims and vagaries of every sort would be introduced as articles of faith and ordinances of God, but the Church would be stripped of all power to drive them out.

Among errors thus precluded we reckon, secondly, that of making human sentiment the test of divine truth. The kinship of this with the error just mentioned becomes apparent upon even a slight examination. But the principle is often so disguised that men who would reject it in its naked form are frequently deceived by the delusive appearance. Experience has taught that many who would tremble at the thought of pronouncing the Holy Scriptures superfluous in the Church, or of declaring them at best but incentives, like human thoughts or divine providences, to exercise the native powers of the soul and thus to develop all needful truth and righteousness from its own recesses, have been led to apply the emotions and desires of their own hearts as the test of truths clearly revealed in the Bible. We mention as an instance the confession of a man whose learning is recognized throughout the church of which he is a member and whose life and labors are regarded as furnishing ample testimony to his sincerity and devotion. In reply to the question why he refused to

accept the doctrine that man must be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he simply said, "Because it does not accord with my feelings." His Methodist experience left no room, in his estimation, for the communication of regenerating power through Baptism. It would be uncharitable, it would even be unjust, to allege that such men would rather formally and expressly renounce the authority of the Scriptures than to dismiss their own erring feelings, which would be simply crucifying the flesh with its affections and lusts. No doubt, when they reflect upon the matter and experience the misgivings which will in such cases inevitably come to sincere minds, they quiet their consciences by the sophistical reflection that they do not reject the Word of God, but only a human interpretation of its meaning. But that is only an evasive attempt to hide the heresy. When the subject is relieved of its entanglement the meaning of such declarations is, in plain language, that the Bible is to be recognized as the divine rule of faith, but as to what is in the Bible and therefore as to what is the rule and norm, that is not to be decided by the words which the Holy Ghost speaks in the Book, but by the words which the Holy Ghost is assumed to speak in the heart. Theoretically the written Scriptures are held in reverence, as supreme authority in the Church, but practically they are supposed to decide nothing, as there always remains the right of appeal from their inspired words to the more sure word of prophecy imbedded in the feelings. It will avail us nothing towards coming to an agreement with such people that they still refer to the Scriptures, and endeavor, by a show of exegetical powers, to justify their decision. When this decision is dictated by their own hearts, independently of the texts which they regard it as

their task, by acts of interpretation, to reduce to harmony with their foregone conclusion, all efforts looking to unity of faith with them are vain. There is no common basis on which it is possible to agree, as there is no agreement in regard to the criterion of truth.

Among the errors thus rejected we reckon, finally, the exaltation of reason, whether theoretically or practically, above the Holy Scriptures. The times are perhaps past in which Rationalism, bold and outspoken, could command respect in the Christian Church. But the principle is not dead, and its influence has not ceased. Its efforts are still but too apparent in the thinking of Christians. While probably no one, in these times, would think of suggesting a union among Lutherans of this country on the basis of agreement in doctrines and practices so far as reason approves them; while perhaps few would even presume that professed Lutherans could consent to relegate all questions of difference between them and the Reformed churches to the forum of individual opinion,—there are still many who so understand, or act as if they so understand, the right of private judgment and liberty of conscience, as if they were not bound to cast down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and to bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. It is natural to consult reason, when the Word of God presents truth unpalatable to the flesh, and the appeal to that false standard is but too often made and too often allowed. Men forget that the preaching of Christ crucified was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness in the apostles' days, and that to the Jews and Greeks of our own time it is a stumbling-block and foolishness still. There would therefore be little chance for the Gospel in the Church,

if the foolishness of man's reason were permitted to decide upon the wisdom of God. Not that the just claims of the human mind were to be discarded by Christians. In the highest sense Christianity is reasonable, because it is the wisdom of God. To present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, is our reasonable service. It is right and proper to study the Holy Scriptures, comparing Scripture with Scripture, and to embrace the truth of God for the comfort of our souls. It is right and proper to use our reason in putting together the various teachings of Scripture upon the same topic and thus to gain a complete view of the truth as a whole. But it is disastrious to exalt reason as the source and standard of divine truth instead of assigning it the place of a humble instrument to apprehend what God is pleased to reveal through the Word inspired by the Spirit and written by holy men of God. This is always done when an appeal is taken from the plain import of God's words to the dictates of so-called common sense, by which phrase but too often is meant common ignorance of spiritual things and common conceit of superior wisdom. That makes the mind of man the ultimate criterion of saving truth, and subjects the supernatural divine revelation to the natural human judgment, which is incapable of discerning it. The whole truth of God is thus placed in jeopardy. What one may permit to stand as in accord with human reason another will reject as irreconcilable with its requirements. All hope of agreement must be abandoned when such a principle is admitted, which substitutes the mind of man for the mind of God as the source of saving truth and as the final test and standard by which its claims are to be judged.

Our principle implies, in the fourth place, that the

entire contents of the Holy Scriptures be accepted as the Word of God, every part having equal divine authority.

It would seem needless to mention this especially were it not that the distinctions which are properly made in regard to the contents of Scripture have often been misunderstood and misapplied, as if they were designed to disparage or deny the divine obligation of any portion of those contents or to promote such disparagement or denial. We recognize the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith. Nay, for the purposes which such a distinction is designed to subserve we think it necessary to go much further. There are many portions of the Word of God which do not belong to the articles of faith at all, whether fundamental or non-fundamental. There is a large proportion which contains law, not gospel, and which accordingly pertains to works, not faith. There is another large portion which treats of those subjects of human history, customs and occupations which are usually embraced in the general name of archaeology. With a view to lucid teaching concerning the varied contents of the Bible it is important to note these distinctions, as it is practically of moment also in selecting topics for pulpit presentation. But it is going sadly astray when portions of the Scripture acknowledged to be of relatively less importance for certain ends are on that account assumed to be less authoritative. In that regard we can recognize no distinction in the contents of the Word of God. Every part has equal divine authority, and the rejection of any part is virtually the rejection of the whole. As whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all, because He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill (James 2, 10. 11), so whosoever rejects a

divine statement on one subject is guilty of rejecting all, because all emanate from the same source and rest upon the same testimony. "He that believeth not God hath made Him a liar." 1 John 5, 10. The relative importance that is to be attached to the contents of any declaration of Scripture for faith and life, for teaching and preaching, for government and discipline, may be a question for consideration, but preliminary to that must be the acceptance of such declaration, whatever decision may be reached as to the practical use to be made of it, as resting upon divine testimony and divinely authoritative and obligatory. With those who claim the right to set aside any part of the Bible, on the plea that what is thus cashiered is not essential, it is impossible for Lutherans to form a union. The point in question may be non-fundamental and may by all be admitted to be such, but the principle cannot be admitted without endangering the whole foundation of our faith. For, in the first place, the organic foundation is thus undermined by subjecting the authority of Holy Scripture to the judgment of men, who are to decide in any given case whether the matter in question is worthy of recognition as binding; and, in the second place, the dogmatic foundation is undermined by submitting to the varying arbitrament of men what shall be regarded as fundamental and therefore necessary to be retained. That thus, in the third place, the personal foundation, which is Christ, must also eventually be swept away is manifest both from the nature of the case, as the carnal mind is enmity against Him especially, and from the facts of history, as these show how the leaven of such a false principle has leavened the whole lump of many a sect.

If any union of Lutherans that is not to be the idle

fancy of a day, but the work of God upon which His blessing shall rest and give it permanence and prosperity, is to be formed in this or any land, it must therefore be based upon the acceptance of Holy Scripture as the supreme and exclusive authority in the Church.

We are aware that this does not decide all. We have not presumed that it does. When we come to apply the principle thus presented and inquire as to what the Holy Scriptures, whose divine authority is fully and honestly recognized and confessed, teach for our learning, we are at once confronted by facts of past history and present experience that place difficulties in the way of union even with many calling themselves Lutherans. The faith once delivered to the saints is to be received and confessed by them. On the authority of the Scriptures we are to receive its contents and be witnesses of them before man. This leads us to another condition of union among Lutherans, to which we shall, if God will, devote a second article. L.

THE TWO TESTAMENTS IN THE ONE REVELATION.

The Bible is the Word of God, revealed through the prophets and apostles as the only true guide to light and life given to erring and lost mankind. The giving of this revelation covered a period of several centuries, and this outward historical process kept steady step with the internal growth in clearness and depth. Externally and internally, the coming of Christ into the flesh divides this revelation from God into two portions, generally called Testaments or Covenants. The relation between these two parts in God's

Word and the unfolding of God's plans for the salvation of man, or the organic connection between the two Testaments must be clearly understood in order to appreciate in all its grandeur and glory the plans of God for man's salvation as He has established and inaugurated these already in the Garden of Eden, has been carrying them out in the dispensations of the Old and the New Testaments, and is now yet carrying them out through the instrumentality of the Christian Church and her work.

That such a close connection exists between the two Testaments is clear from the words and works of Christ and the Apostles. His coming is declared by His forerunner, John the Baptist, and by the Lord Himself to be the beginning of a new dispensation based upon the old, the fulfillment of what had gone before. The burden of the first Christian proclamation was that "the kingdom of God is at hand," announcing to the expectant children of God that the hopes and prayers of former generations were now to be realized, the prophecies and types of earlier centuries now to become facts and truths. Christ and Christianity do thus not only not put themselves in antagonism to the preceding revelation and the course of God's kingdom of which this revelation is the record, but distinctly and emphatically maintain their close connection with it, supplementing, complementing and fulfilling what had gone before. The Savior came in the fullness of time, when the period of preparation, inwardly and outwardly, among the Jews and among the Gentiles, had been completed. He came not as an historical anomaly, least of all in the unfolding of God's revelation in word and deed. Both Christ and His work, as also the whole New Testament dispensation, both as regards the great historical facts recorded in the Gospels, as also the

depths of divine instruction that come from the lips of the Savior and the pen of His disciples, avowedly and repeatedly claim to be built upon Moses and the Prophets, upon the revelation of the Old Testament. Not only is such a claim maintained and proved *in thesi* by such works as the Gospel according to St. Matthew and the letter to the Hebrews, which *ex-professo* discuss this theme, but in all the other books of the New Testament this important truth is taught directly and indirectly, expressly and by implication. Without the Old Testament, the New has no foundation either historically or doctrinally.

It is indeed true that Christ opposes the Jewish theology of His day; but He does so because the Jews, and not He, had departed from the revealed landmarks of faith. The Pharasaic system, which was the accepted orthodoxy of the contemporaries of Christ, had internally broken with all the revelation and history of God's people, and for that reason Christ broke with it. Christ scourges the religious teachers of His day because they did not represent the faith and life of the Old Testament religion. Instead of believing with Abraham, David, the prophets and other typical representatives of the true religion of the Old Testament, that man is justified before God by faith in His promises and grace, they had set up the human figment of a self-righteousness and had perverted the religion of revelation into a system of human errors. In the centuries after the voice of prophecy was hushed in Israel and before it was re-awakened in John the Baptist, a wonderful change had taken place in the belief of the people of God, and out of the band that returned from the captivity with the lessons of humility and faith in their heart, had grown a religious sect that claimed to be able to fulfill the law of God and secure its own righteous-

ness before the throne of the great Judge. On account of this error, this greatest of apostacies in the history of the world, Christ necessarily resisted the system of teaching in vogue in His day. And this He did simply because His teachings were so firmly rooted in the old dispensation, He could not go hand in hand with those who had succeeded in basing Israel's hope on a false and unhistorical foundation. Positively and negatively then, both through His own direct statements as also through His opposition to the false representatives of the Old Testament revelation, the Lord's attitude points to a most intimate and complementary relationship between the two dispensations, of which the two Testaments are the inspired records. There is indeed much that is new in Christianity and in the revelation of Christianity; but it is all based upon that which is old in the kingdom of God on earth.

The attitude of the Lord, and indeed of the whole New Testament, toward the Old shows how closely the two are connected, and wherein the relationship consists. "The kingdom of God is at hand" preaches John the Baptist and preaches Christ the Lord, and thus they show that the kingdom of God is the connecting link between the two Testaments of the one revelation. Both are the records of the establishment and development of this kingdom of God on earth, the one indicating the form which this kingdom assumed when in its preparatory stage, within the limits of a nation and the limitation of a stringent legal code, both of which were intended, according to the divine plan, to prepare the way for the time when this kingdom could step out and beyond the limits of nationality and circumscribed locality, could become the common property of all in a higher and spiritualized sense; the other record showing

how this ideal aim and goal of the earlier dispensation became a history and a fact through Christ and His work. They both represent the two great historical phases of the unfolding and growth of the one kingdom of God on earth; and in this thought they find their central idea and their connecting link.

It is a totally false conception of the Hebrew Scriptures —although it is a view quite popular among the so-called advanced critics of the Old Testament—to look upon the Hebrew Scriptures in the same light in which we regard the literary remains of other countries. The Old Testament is not an accidental collection of literary remains of a very interesting member of the oriental family of peoples, whose chief aim consists in furnishing an index to the intellectual and spiritual status of this nation. Even if such a hypothesis is maintained by the learning of men like Kuenen, Wellhausen and others, the whole wisdom of this standpoint is merely a vulgar rationalism. Kuenen himself states that one of the propositions which he regards as settled and upon which he builds his whole critical superstructure, is that the religions of Israel and of Christianity are two of many religions, differing only in degree but not in kind from the other religions of the world, and that the revelations upon which these two religions are based are of equal authority only with the literary sources of the others, such as the Vedas, the Coran, the works of Zoroaster.* We have no Hebrew literature in the sense in which we have Sanskrit, Latin and Greek literatures. The Scriptures claim to be, and are, peculiar writings, just as the religion of which they bear record is a peculiar religion. They are the announcement of the plan of God for the salvation of men,

* Cf. Kuenen's *De Godsdienst van Israel.* 1, 5 sqq.

and record how this plan gradually through many centuries, and amid various and diversified surroundings unfolded and grew, internally and externally, until in Christ and the Christian Church, is found its consummation and present shape. This is the all-controlling idea and power not only in the course of history of which the Old Testament gives us an account, but also in the composition and selection of those books which compose the cause of the Old Covenant, and there is accordingly nothing random or accidental in this collection of sacred books. Looking at the Old Testament, and also at the new, from any other standpoint, is unhistorical and false. They do not claim to be a political history of Israel, nor a history of the civilization or intellectual development of that nation, and accordingly if appealed to in order to furnish the material for such sciences, they prove to be fragmentary and unsatisfactory. But when appealed to for a complete, succinct, clear and transparent account of the glorious plans of God for the deliverance of man from eternal destruction, they are satisfactory and complete. It is within the golden circle then of the development of the kingdom of God that the sacred books move, and by this they are circumscribed and within this they have their mission and teach their lesson.

In describing the manner in which this kingdom of God was established and started on its historical mission, the Scriptures with one accord start out from the premises that man has sinned and come short of the glory of God. The fall of man is, in time and space, the starting point of this kingdom, although in all eternity the salvation of man through the atonement of Christ had been decided upon in the council of mercy at the throne of the triune God. Without presupposing the fall of man and the existence of

a deep chasm between the Creator and the creature, the Word of God is absolutely unintelligible, and attempts to explain the Book of books from a standpoint excluding sin and the total corruption of man can end only in the wildest caricatures of the revealed truth. Not only is this fundamental truth of all revelation stated explicitly in the opening chapters of Genesis, in the psalmist's songs and the prophets' sermons, but it is presupposed by and lies at the bottom of all the books of the Bible. This dire fact stands at the head of all revelation, and forms the outward occasion of all of God's deeds for man, which deeds have all for their only and sole object, the re-establishment of man and the restoration of the original relation between the fallen creature and his God, the redemption of man from the consequences of sin.

When man had rebelled against his Maker and thus through sin had fallen from his high estate, God, in His mercy, resolves to save him. While the justice of Jehovah pronounces condemnation on Adam and Eve and their whole generation for their sin, the love and mercy of God at the same time proclaims the Gospel of Grace. In the protevangelium of Genesis 3 we have the whole doctrine of salvation *in nuce*. The seed of the woman shall crush the serpent's head: the Child of promise shall undo the work of transgression. Such was the promise in Paradise, and of this promise the fulfillment was effected in Christ Jesus, and all of revelation and God's wonderful guidance of the one peculiar people was directed toward this fulfillment when the fullness of time should have arrived. And that such a fullness of time should arrive, and that salvation should be prepared and ready for man and man be ready and prepared for salvation, was the whole aim of the

Old Testament dispensation. For naturally as man had of his own free will fallen from God and entered the services of Satan, so too God could not and would not have *forced* him against his will to accept a salvation from the consequence of an act to which he had consented, knowing these consequences. Accordingly an educational process was necessary; it was necessary that man should learn of his true condition, should be convinced of the heinousness of sin, of his merited condemnation, and become convinced that a restoration to the lost estate was his only hope and that the fulfillment of this hope depended solely upon his acceptance, as a gift of free grace, of this restoration which the very God, against whom he had so flagrantly sinned, was willing to grant to all. To effect this educational process with all of its conditions and consequences, in the hearts of men, and make it a lesson of history was the aim of the dealings of God with His people under the Old Covenant.

The form in which God decided to work out this educational process was that of a covenant between Himself and mankind. He established a covenant or special relation between Himself and the creature, according to which He would be a God and Father to them and they should stand in a relation of confiding obedience to Him, following implicitly His guidance and providential leading. But men would not long submit to such a covenant, and would not yield faith and obedience to the Lord who hated sin. Accordingly it was not long before the sons of Adam were, with a comparatively few exceptions, again arrayed against their God. The deluge followed as a punishment of this disobedience, and God again establishes a covenant upon the same basis with the family of Noah. The same story of rebellion was repeated, and soon sin again ruled supreme.

God had promised not again to destroy mankind on account of their sins, and he accordingly selects one man out of the many to become the bearer of a new covenant. That man was Abraham. In order to make effective the terms of this covenant, God removes Abraham from the midst of the idolatrous temptations of his kinsmen, and takes him to the Land of Promise. The covenant with Abraham is based upon faith. Its terms are that he shall have implicit faith and confidence in God's words and guidance, and in return the Lord would bless him and in him bless all the nations of the earth. Cf. Gen. 15, 6. Gal. 3, 6. Rom. 4, 3.

As long as the covenant remained within the family it was possible to awaken the necessary conditions of this covenant in the hearts of the participants through direct communication with God. And in this way the Lord did really guide the destinies of Abraham's family, communicated with him in various manners according to his needs of the covenant relation and thus cause the principles and truths of this covenant to grow and ever to take firmer root in the hearts of the patriarchs. When however this family grew into a nation, then too the covenant assumed a national form. In the nature of things it was not possible that God should continue the educational process with each and every individual of this chosen people through immediate intercourse which He had maintained with their fathers. In order that they too, as the individuals had done, might learn the lesson of their own sin and the conviction that the only means of righteousness and acceptance before the Lord was faith and the obedience of faith, he gives to Israel the Sinaitic law. The covenant of Mount Sinai is not a new covenant, but the Abrahamic covenant adapted to the new and enlarged conditions. The purpose

of the law is merely to effect within Israel as a nation what the direct word of communication from God had effected in the hearts of the patriarchs. The purpose of the law was in no wise to form a norm according to which Israel should walk and worship in order to prove acceptable before God, for the purpose of regaining what had been lost through sin; but rather its object was, by showing Israel what the just and lawful claims of the Lord of the covenant were, how little they could comply with these demands, and how much they needed a dependence and a faith in the pardoning grace of their God. The law represented to the people the sum of the just rights of the Lord of the covenant over against the people who had entered into the covenant relation with the Lord in order to secure the blessings this covenant would bring with itself. This legal code governed the whole conduct of the people both as a political body and as a religious communion, as God had determined to work out the conditions of the covenant within the bounds of our nationality and our country. Accordingly there was no distinction or difference between a moral and a ceremonial law as far as those were concerned who lived under the theocratic rule. The laws represented the duties owing to the Lord, and a violation of any of them was a sin, no matter whether this violation was against the strictly religious or the political ordinances. The difference between the moral and the ceremonial law is not a formal distinction made by the Old Testament, but a material distinction made by the historical course of God's kingdom on earth. But the law as a whole represented the duties of man in his covenant relation, and that a performance of such duties was an impossibility is recognized even by the law itself. For in connection with the legal enactments are also estab-

lished the various sacrifices and atonements for the restoration of him who had not complied with the demands of this covenant. Had the law-giver or the law really from the beginning contemplated the possibility on man's part of fulfilling these conditions of the covenant, no such ordinances making atonement for their violations would have been given in the same breath with the announcement of the law and the penalty of its transgression. The aim and purpose of the law was to teach man his inability to be a true child of the covenant, his inability to live without constantly sinning, and hence the need and necessity of some one who should do the work which he was not able to do. In other words the law was to be a schoolmaster unto Christ, as Paul says Gal. 3, 24. That the law did really subserve such a purpose and drive those living under it to a knowledge of their sins and to the pardoning grace of Jehovah, who had promised to receive and accept all who would come in repentance, is apparent from the lives of those who can fairly be regarded as typical representatives of Old Testament faith. We never hear of a Samuel, David, an Elijah appealing to their own obedience to God's commands as a ground for righteousness. No one is more ready to acknowledge his sins than is the great psalm-singer in Israel, and his and others experience shows how thoroughly the legitimate lesson of the law had been learned.

But the covenant had another side. It was not all commands, not all threats, nor were its lessons learned when merely the conviction of transgression and unworthiness had been awakened in the souls of those who lived under it. In the psalms of David we hear not only the wail of woe over his innumeral sins, but also the voice of gladness over the assurance that the Lord would in mercy pardon him

who confessed his sin. And this was the positive side of the covenant relation between God and Israel. For side by side with the law and its negative purpose of awakening in man the need of and desire for divine pardon and for a redeemer, we find prophecy proclaiming the advent, at the proper time, of Him who alone would in His life and death offer a sufficient guarantee to God's justice for all the shortcomings of man and his disobedience to the law. Prophecy announced to the people the grace of God and that this grace would have its objective ground in the One who would appear as the chosen Messenger of God. It is a mistaken idea to think that the prophets were mere foretellers of the future, that they spoke chiefly or primarily for future generations; they were in the first instance the preachers of God's grace to their own people and hearers. And throughout the whole course of the Old Testament dispensation, from the protevangelium to the Evangelistic flights of Isaiah 53, there is a golden chain of divine promises concerning the coming of a Savior, steadily these increase in light, transparancy and clearness, until at times, as in the servant of Jehovah in the second part of Isaiah, they seem not to be prophecies of the future but rather a history of the past. The law and the Messianic prophecies are the two leading features of the Old Testament covenant, mutually complementary, working out in Israel as individuals and as a nation, and working out also as a problem and fact of history, the great principles of sin and condemnation on the part of man, pardon and free grace on the part of God, as the fonndation of the true relation between God and man in order to restore to the exalted estate the man who had wilfully transgressed. This was the educational process through which Israel, in the providence of God, passed. The joint mission of these two leading

features of the covenant was a propaedeutic one. The one ended with the question for a Deliverer, and in types and symbols endeavored to get a foretaste of the mercies he would bring to those who through their disobedience so sadly stood in need of them; the other declared that such a Savior would, at the proper time, make his appearance, sent by Jehovah. The legal features of the old dispensation pointed to the need of a Savior; the prophets proclaimed His advent; the psalmists and other Old Testament writers show how the pious grew in this faith, and how their religious life and belief were developed under such a covenant. All these books and facts however continue to portray the course of the development of the kingdom of God on earth in its preparatory stage, within the limits of a nation and the hedge of a legal code.

The completion of all this preparation we find in the New Testament. The promised Messiah has come; the types, symbols and prophecies have been fulfilled, the inability of man to make himself righteous before God has become the lesson of centuries of bitter experience; and at the same time, the history of the Gentile people whom God had permitted to wander after their own heart, emphasized the lesson taught by Israel's history, namely that man is sinful and when left to himself can bring forth only the prints of sin. The kingdom of God on earth can now throw off its limits of nationality, and with this also that burden of the law, both political and in reference to worship, upon which this national feature was based and by which it was prescribed, and in a more spiritualized form can receive and bless all who will hear the words of grace and pardon. The difference then between the two Testaments is one of degree merely and not of kind. In principle both

are the same, basing upon faith all righteousness and the restoration to the lost estate. Both point to a Redeemer, to a Savior, to *the* Christ, as the only foundation of hope. They differ in this, that the Old represents the preparatory stage of this kingdom, the growth of God's plans for man's redemption in a particularistic form within the national limits of one people and country, and under the national hedge of a vigorous law; the New announces that the promises of the Old have become glorious facts through the coming of Christ into the flesh, removes the national barrier, and calls into the kingdom all the nations of the world, and at the same time spiritualizes the kingdom by the removal of the ceremonial features of the law, and makes the obedience of faith the work of an acceptable life.

The Old and the New are indeed two Testaments and two dispensations, but they are the Testaments and dispensations of the one kingdom of God, of the one revelation.

G. H. S.

PAPER RESOLUTIONS.

"*Resolved*, That we do herewith solemnly pledge ourselves individually and collectively to put forth our very best efforts in order to," and so forth, and so forth. Then follow the usual wise deliberation and pleasurable debate; finally the ayes and the nays are demanded; then there is the decision, it may be of unanimous approval; then a flutter of self-satisfaction runs through the august assembly, and there are mutual congratulations by nodding of heads and smiling of smiles; and then, like hens cackling over a fresh-laid egg, they noise abroad the thing to be done, and

men everywhere marvel at the wisdom, the life, the activity, the self-sacrifice of the body sitting in Hatchtown; and then—well, that is the end of the whole business! The hen's deposit once more turns out to be an addle-egg.

Paper resolutions proceedings of this kind are called; whether with feelings of regret or of derision, or with a mixture of both, depends on the mood of the speaker. Duties openly recognized or obligations freely assumed but soon forgotten and never fulfilled, great moral evils, downright nuisances, that is what they are. Be their merit great or small, in either case, broken promises and abandoned contracts are very discreditable things to everybody; for there is dereliction somewhere, be it in the making or in the breaking of them.

It is a deplorable state of affairs that church-bodies have fallen into this bad way; and, what is worse, that Christian men are not more sensible of its wrong, its hurtfulness and its dishonor, than is the case. When it is observed that the clergical element preponderates in such bodies and that, as a rule, the lay-delegates are from among the most intelligent and active members of the congregations represented, it becomes questionable whether a general spiritual lethargy will alone account for the evil; whether there be not some loose principle, or principles misunderstood, at the bottom of it. The root of the disease can best direct the choice of the remedy; and if the sin of paper resolutions is rather the fruit of some error in the doctrine than a manifestation of weakness in the life of the Church, then must the doctrine be corrected before a more healthy and vigorous practice can be looked for.

The Church's rules and determinations are something distinct from the commandments of God, and in no way

dare be opposed to them. Now the very fact that they are the ordinances and decisions of men and not of God misleads some people to draw conclusions not at all warranted. They think it a very small thing when they pay no attention to such enactments. They seem to be of the opinion that moral transgression is impossible here. And this no doubt is one of the errors which account for paper resolutions. Being an error it may indeed explain the bad habit but, of course, in no way justify it. To combat such views it will be necessary to elucidate somewhat the nature and purpose, the necessity and importance, and the binding character of churchly regulations in general.

Demanded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, the Lord answered them and said: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or, Lo there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you." Luke 17, 20. 21. When here the spiritual nature of God's kingdom or Church is set forth, this is done over against all such carnal notions as the Jews entertained concerning it, and not in opposition to, or in derogation of, the Church as it may manifest itself in external organization. It is just as much a divine institution in this its latter aspect as it is with respect to the inner side of its existence; for the Church visible and the Church invisible are in their ultimate reality not two churches, but they are one and the same Church, only considered from different points of view. Now look upon the Church external, if you will, as being nothing more than the scaffolding erected in order to the building up of the real edifice, to-wit, the Church internal, yet is the scaffolding for the time being indispensable to the workmen and in so far a necessary adjunct to the edifice itself. As a matter of fact, however,

the relation is a much closer one than this. Churches are the product of the Church, so that the life of the latter diffuses itself through the former and becomes manifestly active in them, and this in reaction upon itself. Churchdom, as the aggregate of Christian congregations and these considered apart from everything strange attaching itself to them, may be said to be the Church become incarnate. And this as a matter of necessity; for the Church is not a body of spirits but a body of human beings, and though it is not of this world yet is it in the world.

There is indeed nowhere in the Scripture an express command enjoining Christians to enter into a formal union among themselves; but the reason of this is no doubt found in the entire naturalness as also in the necessity and advantages of such a union. Then too is the lack of an explicit word of institution more than made good by the many implicit evidences furnished to the same effect. Not only is it recorded that Christian congregations everywhere sprang up under the influence of the Gospel, but the entire word of God is written on the very presumption that the Church of God constitute itself as it did then and has continued to do at all times. Accordingly the Scriptures in many places address the believers as members not only of the Church but of Churches, that is, as individuals who are in a corporate capacity separate from the world and bound together among themselves. Vide e. g. Matt. 18, 17; Acts 2, 47; 20, 28; 1 Cor. 14, 28–34; 1 Tim. 3, 5; etc.

As citizens of the same kingdom, as children of the same house, as branches of the same vine, yes, as members of the same body, Christians are brought into a very close relation to one another. They being many, yet "are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3, 27. "Now ye are the body of

Christ, and members in particular." 1 Cor. 12, 27. (See the entire chapter). But since members of the same body, they are fellow members among themselves. From this it follows that he, who is at all conscious of the organic nature of the relation into which he has been introduced, will in all his actions have respect to the weal and woe of the whole body and of each member in particular. As do the members of the human body, so will the members of the body of Christ live and labor together, each one in the place allotted to him, for the good of the common body. In fact, there can be nothing more foreign to the nature of the Church and nothing more detrimental to its mission, than are divisions among its members and a lack of co-operation among them. "Now I beseech you brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." 1 Cor. 1, 10. True, "joined together in mind," that is, internally; but this unity is to result in an outward union and harmony of action also; for in no way must the form be allowed to belie the spirit. Christians are called not only to believe in Christ but also to confess Him, to love Him not only but also to serve Him; and as there is to be unity in the true faith and love of Him, so is there to be union on the ground and strength of that unity in their confession and service of Christ before the world.

Since then the churches are a necessary and natural product of the divine life and an agency indispensable to the building up of the kingdom of God within the hearts of men, it follows that they must be invested with such authority of action as is needed to secure the integrity of their righteous existence and the successful discharge of

their divine mission. And as this double object furnishes us the ground for it, likewise may it serve us to determine the limits of such authority, and be used as a criterion for its right exercise. Constitutions and by-laws, rules and regulations, counsels and resolutions, to be truly churchly in their character, dare not only in nothing militate against the letter and spirit of the divine word, but they must also positively promote or tend to promote the legitimate ends of churchly organization and activity.

That Christian churches, viewed also as they are constituted on earth and with respect to it, possess the power of self-government subject to the word of God, it may here suffice to cite Acts 15, both in evidence of it and at the same time as showing its scope. Sentence is there given by the men and brethren of the churches from among the Jews that they of the Gentiles who are turned to God be enjoined to "abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood." Here the Gentile Christians were required to abstain from such things not only as are in themselves unlawful before God, but also from such as are indeed lawful in themselves but doing which gave offence to the Jewish Christians. And that in this matter the brethren assembled at Jerusalem were not assuming powers which did not belong to them, of that they were thoroughly convinced. "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," they wrote; and on that ground they based their conclusions.

It will be found however that generally the Word of God enounces only the principles and not the forms of order and deportment. It tells us that "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints;" and it commands that "all things be done decently, and in

order." 1 Cor. 14, 33 and 40: and "Let all your things be done in charity," 1 Cor. 16, 14; "submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God." Eph. 5, 21. As to the particular forms of the Christian's work and walk—as to the many questions of when and where and how—the Word of God is often silent, so that these are things to be determined largely by Christians and by the Christian churches themselves, subject to and directed by the divine Word as far as that may be available. Here then it is where the human element enters and must enter into the ordering of the affairs pertaining to the Church. Howbeit, it is the human element enlightened and sanctified, employed in God's service and intent on doing His will, strengthened by His grace, supported by His approval, and to be crowned with His blessing. "It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost, and to us:" such is the faith if not the form in which every true Christian church will come before its people with each and every resolution of its framing.

In view then of the Christian life pervading it, of the holy and happy end to be attained through it, and of the divine sanction with which it is impressed, no measure of the Church bearing such characteristics can be slighted without offence to God as well as to men. All the greater of course is the transgression when the delinquent himself was a party to the passing of the measure, since to the wrong in general he adds the sins of deception and of a breach of faith with all their consequent evils.

To be sure, Church-bodies also are liable to make mistakes; and their determinations may at times be unwise, or unnecessarily grievous, or partial, or even iniquitous. But such resolutions are not contemplated in the subject under discussion. When measures of that sort become a

dead letter, there is cause not for complaint but for congratulation. All human enactments should be thoroughly examined as to their lawfulness, equity and expediency, both when proposed and before they are executed. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind" before he act or be required to act, in order that nothing be done in doubt. The fact is that lack of knowledge is a second and very potent cause of paper resolutions. In his endeavor to enlist his congregation for the work of the Church, a pastor is frequently defeated simply because he fails to impart the necessary information. The reason of this neglect is not always the same. In their judgment of their people some pastors are entirely too optimistic: they think that they need but say the word and all will eagerly rally to do the pleasure of the Church. Such enthusiasm generally expends itself in a very short time,—not finding an object quite worthy of itself—, but it may do a great deal of mischief while it lasts. Others fall into the opposite extreme: they are entirely too pessimistic; with them it is a foregone conclusion that their people "will give, will do nothing anyhow; and so their is no use of talking to them." Then again there are those whose presumption on the knowledge of their people is too strong and whose confidence in their good will is too weak. The one is a mistake, the other is a wrong. Unless convinced of the contrary, charity requires the pastor to assume that his people are ready to do the Lord's will in all things and to build up his kingdom as best they can. But they may need to be taught what the will of the Lord is. They must be made to see that the particular work in which they are asked to engage is beyond all doubt God's work, that God wants *them* to do it, and that the ways and means proposed for its doing are adequate and

necessary to its execution. And in order to this, the instruction imparted must be thoroughly supported by divine authority, be plain, pointed and persistent. Persistent; for, if nothing worse, ignorance, prejudices and excuses of all sorts may have to be overcome. When in the opinion of the pastor a matter is made never so plain, there may be still many who fail to understand it. Not having had his training, it cannot be expected that the people be as quick to comprehend as is the theologian. When therefore the pastor and member of synod comes short of doing his duty in this particular, then too does he violate the promise set out in the resolution, to-wit, "that we put forth our very best efforts."

No, nothing whatever promulgated by men and as of men—and were these the most wise and holy of our race—is co-ordinate with the commandments of God; but before anyone rejects a human requirement addressed to himself, let him be fully persuaded that there be nothing divine about it, lest by his refusal to do the will of man he oppose the will of God. Neither are Christians in any way whatever to be deprived of that liberty wherewith Christ has made them free and thus be made again, contrary to the Scriptures, the servants of men. This to such as are, not without good cause, righteously jealous of their liberty, knowing the price wherewith they are bought. At the same time it is quite possible to have and to hold one's liberty, "for an occasion to the flesh," Gal. 5, 13, "for a cloak of maliciousness," 1 Pet. 2, 16 and as "a stumbling block to them that are weak," 1 Cor. 8, 9. That confused notions about liberty and its ready liability to every manner of abuse do much to hinder the work of the Church from becoming effective, there is no doubt. Pressed for an answer why this

or that resolution is not carried out, not a few will tell you plainly that they can do as they please about it; and with this retort insist that the subject be dismissed and themselves be left free to go their way in peace.

There are occasions when the Christian may, nay, when he must assert his liberty; and that is, when he is tempted in any way and to any extent either to surrender or to abuse it. Such is the case when, for example, others would set themselves up as above him by divine right, and so destroy that parity into which God has lifted up His children before Himself. Then also, when the commandments of men are given out for commandments of God. And again, when any work whatever is required of him on the plea that his justification and salvation can be merited by its doing. These heresies, and others of a kind much the same, are taught and practiced in Popedom; but there is cause for men in Christendom everywhere to be on their guard against them. "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Gal. 5, 1. It is against these papistic abominations especially, that Protestantism directs its solemn and emphatic assertion of the truth of God and of that truth's supremacy. However, not everything that would be called so is Protestantism; above all, not that which looks upon and uses some of its best principles as though they were letters-patent to all sorts of liberties and excesses.

The liberty of the Christian which Christ secures to him, of which the Gospel is the magna charta and for which pure Protestantism contends, so far as it comes under consideration here, to wit, the liberty of the Christian life, is not an exemption from any good work nor a

permit to any evil work. "As free," says the apostle, "and not using your liberty as a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God." "As free" and "as the servants of God" he puts in apposition. But how: the servants, yes, the bond-servants of God, and yet as the free? Yes, and yet there is no contradiction here, unless freedom be falsely construed and taken to mean absolute independency of action, a something to which in its bold iniquity the human heart has time and again aspired, but never attained. Nor shall it; for the only independent One is God Himself. The Christian, however, who has at all a proper conception of freedom will know, strange and paradoxical as it may seem, that the more thoroughly a man is become the servant of God, all the more thoroughly is he made free. Free, because a servant of God is he whose will is so renewed and disposed by the divine grace and truth that, by virtue of this its new nature, it freely and gladly concurs in the will of God in all things. "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John 8, 36. O blessed freedom! for the will of God, and not the will of man until it has become one with it, is man's salvation.*

But now, what the grace and truth of God by Christ Jesus does for the mind and heart of one child and servant of God, the same it does for all. The wills of Christians are all brought into accord with the one will of God, and thus also into accord with one another: they are of like mind;

---

* On this important subject see Luther's noted letter to *Jerome Muehlphort*, of 1520, "On the Liberty of a Christian;" and in which he discusses the two propositions, first: *that the Christian is free, a lord over all things and subject to nobody;* second, *that the Christian is not free a servant of all things and subject to everybody.* Erl. Ed. vol. 27.

for they have all received the Spirit of Christ. Furthermore, as by reason of this coalescence of their wills with the one will of God they are all made free with respect to God, so are they at the same time made free with respect to one another, so that there is an inward spiritual freedom all around. In God they all will the same thing, and hence among them all no one is either the master or the slave of the other. The only Master in their household is the God over all, blessed for ever, and He their Father. That the reality does not come up to the ideal of the blessed relation as here set forth, is true; and this will be the case always as long as the Church is the Church militant. But to make for this perfection, according to the grace given them, are God's children called; and to this end should they pray and labor, and, if need be, fight and suffer.

Now what a strange and gross perversion of holy truth when men, Christian men, having failed to labor together in the work of the Lord with their fellow Christian, plead in excuse of it their Christian liberty, be it to quiet themselves or to satisfy others. The good God has set them free to serve Him according to the strength, the means and the opportunity given them; and they? they interpret this to mean the liberty to do or not to do, just as they please! Heaven's charter of liberty is in their hands become a license to sins of omission, if to nothing worse. "As free!" always and in every thing "as free!" But the words which follow, "not using your liberty as a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God," they do not care to heed; they know not whereof they boast. They are as blind to what a free child of God is as were the angry and lying Pharisees which, when Jesus upbraided them for their self-conceit, said, "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be free?" John 8, 33; et seq.

Wherever Christian liberty is properly understood, and in its purity is become a living principle in the heart, there it will not be put forward in excuse for neglect of the church's work. Unless there be something morally objectionable in the substance and purpose of a resolution or in the motive and manner of its presentation, the free child of God is ever ready to carry it out as best he can. With these modifications and with the one other, to-wit, that the work proposed in them be not entirely adiaphorous either in itself or in its immediate bearings, paper resolutions, if at all its product, are the product of Christian liberty betrayed and traduced, and therefore its illegitimate children. As to measures of an adiaphorous import, the member of the Church may be free to give or to withhold his assent, assist or not assist in their execution. May be free, and yet again he may not be free to do just as he pleases: for also in such things he may please unto sin. He is right, for example, when he thinks a cross a much more appropriate emblem to point a Church-spire with, than a weather-cock is. Nevertheless, should the predilection of his fellow members for the cock be so strong that the alternative of a church with it or no church at all is placed before him, then should he vote and work for its building despite the bird that is to top it. He should consider the importance of the work proposed as a whole, and do nothing to frustrate it simply on account of a distasteful feature in connection with it. Acting contrariwise, he hinders the work of the Lord, and therefore sins. If it be objected that the majority must not want to rule the minority, it may be answered: neither must the minority want to rule the majority. In cases of this nature the liberty of submission to others, even to the froward, is to be exercised, and that charity which, as the

good Book says, suffereth long and is kind, envieth not, vaunteth not itself and is not puffed up, does not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth, beareth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. 1 Cor. 13.

As taught by the proceedings of the Christians assembled at Jerusalem, the Church may also at times ask its members to use their liberty by not using it, as when its enjoyment would give offence to the weak in the faith. Now that no Christian sees any wrong in it, the injunction to abstain from blood has lost both its ground and force, and is without injury to any body become a dead letter, except that it serves the Church as a precedent for action under similar circumstances. Exemplary and worthy of imitation at all times was the way in which the Christians at Antioch received the epistle addressed to them, "which when they had read, they rejoiced for the consolation." Acts 15, 31.

View the subject from any point whatsoever, no valid excuse is found for the evil of paper resolutions. An aberration from the truth of some kind is at the bottom of it, be it in the principle or in the life of those concerned, or in both. If in the life only, then must the great wrong and injury of it be all the more impressed, as also the supreme importance of united and harmonious action in the work of the Church be urged with all the force of quickening love.

The harm done to the Church generally and to souls in particular is greater than may be imagined. The waste of precious time and of large amounts of money incurred by the passage of such resolutions, is the first thing to be deplored; and this alone is an item of sufficient moment to put a stop to the evil. To see men come together from many

parts of the States at great expense to themselves and others, and then laboriously resolve on work never to be executed, is a sad spectacle, and one which, while it injures the consciences of those who are a party to it, afflicts the hearts of all good men.

Worse than this waste of means is the deception practiced on others. The import of many resolutions is of such a nature that its execution depends entirely on the joint action of all concerned; and it is a shameful imposition to have others put their shoulders to a burden, which alone they can never bear, all the while thinking that their brethren, as agreed, are doing likewise when in reality these are deceiving them. They labor on the strength of confidence; but of a confidence misplaced, and hence they labor if not in vain, yet without effect as regards the good work to be accomplished. Great offence is thus given; bitter disappointment is felt; and that mutual confidence, which is so very necessary to the Lord's workman, is frivolously weakened. Ah, how sadly is the coming of the kingdom to the souls of men hindered by thoughtlessness, neglect, deceit and treachery of this kind, be it intended or not! Then too, on account of the close connection between objective Christianity and Christianity become subjective, people will reason from the latter to the former; and so, unreasonable though it is, many poor souls having their faith in Christians repeatedly put to shame loose their faith in Christ Himself. They perish from the effects of paper resolutions.

Brethren, quit you like men!

C. H. L. S.

THE TREATMENT OF THE OATH IN THE SERMON, IN CATECHISATION AND IN PRIVATE PASTORAL-MINISTRATIONS.

BY A. ALTHAUS.

Translated from the German by A. P.

NOTE.—The following article was written by a resident of Germany, and has reference, therefore, to circumstances prevailing in that country. It is, however, also applicable to our own surroundings, and therefore we do not deem it out of place to give it to our readers in an English dress.

If, in order to obtain the proper standpoint for our theme, we first of all inquire after the causes of the prevalent profanation of the oath, we will find that the chief of them can be none other than the growing lack of piety in the hearts and life of the people. If faith in the living God departs from man, if he no longer stands in awe of the omniscient and holy God who can destroy both soul and body in hell, then he also no longer shrinks from the worst, the world is then his God to win which he sets everything into motion, according to his wants. To such an internally intractable and ruined person the oath is nothing more than a ceremony behind which no one stands but the judge whom one can deceive. The manner in which a people deports itself with reference to swearing and keeping the oath, is therefore a correct instrument with which to measure the degree of its religious standing. According to that, however, the latter must among us now and then have sunk far below zero.

Nor is this to be wondered at. For belief in God, the fear of God, is closely connected with faith in the revelation of God in Scripture. If the latter is erroneous, if it gives

way, then the former is also expelled, and Satan tears all down, the building has lost its foundation. But already too long, too systematically has the effort been put forth, and is yet put forth with all possible means, to make void the word of the Bible as a parable, to smile at it as a fable, to cast suspicion upon it as a deception and as fiction, to stigmatize faith in it as stupidity and as remaining behind the age, that it can not be otherwise but that the hurricane from the deserts, which is ever being stirred up anew, must have made a far-reaching and all-destroying shipwreck of the faith of many. And because the Living God is with us in and with His Word only, the soul also loses its God in losing His Word; without God it lives in the world. Then obedience to God, the fear of Him, ceases. Of what is the soul then not capable?

In this connection we do not need nor desire to close our eyes to that in our present legislation and court-practice which can aid in profaning the taking of the oath, or at least does not appear favorable to making the oath sacred. . . . In the Consistorial Proclamation of the 23rd of November, 1863, we read: "The State might well consider whether, perhaps, a still greater decreasing of the governmental oaths might not take place by doing away with all those which are perchance not indispensable or are especially subject to abuse; further, whether any more instructions should be issued respecting the form and manner which are to be observed on the part of the officials in administering oaths in the interest of their seriousness and dignity; and finally, whether more assistance and opportunity should be given for spiritual instruction and admonition, by means of a more methodical, more frequent, but especially—in particular cases—a more timely calling in of

the clergy in order sufficiently to prepare the persons permitted by the courts to take the oath." With this we fully agree. Only let us not forget: legislation, court-practice nowhere fall from the skies, are never something purely theoretical, but always more or less the product of an already established condition within the hearts of the people, against which, in case it is a defective and menacing one, the State stands on the defensive, and against which it must protect itself with its legislation, in order to make sure its existence and, in spite of the existing defect, to be able to attain its ends. If the State has found itself compelled to demand the more frequent taking of the oath, in such a way that statements and testimonies in respect even to the most trivial matters, are scarcely accepted by the courts any more, unless they are confirmed by an oath, it must already have had some sad experience with reference to the spirit of falsehood which has gained room and strength far and wide among its adherents, and against which it does not, in its sphere, know how to protect itself otherwise than by multiplying the oath. The spirit of falsehood, however, having grown strong, points to the lack of piety, and the case presents itself thus: the present legislation and court-practice have not given birth, nor helped to give birth, to the prevalent evil of profaning the oath; but this legislation is itself a symptom of an existing deadly disease which has its roots where all death has its roots—in the vanished or vanishing fear of God.

Let us therefore leave the State with its legislation out of the account. Least of all do we make it responsible. We cannot even give it correct advice. For the only decisive means which is able against the profanation of the oath to awaken piety, is the Word of God. But the foster-

ing of this has not been intrusted to the State, therefore it is also not to operate with it. Only this can and will we say: As certainly as it must be of the highest interest to the State on account of its own existence that the oath be held sacred by its subjects and that the abuse of it be thoroughly hindered, so certainly must it take the greatest interest in this that the Word of God be rightly used and richly fostered by the people. It is to give itself as a nurse and a mother to the Church, to which by the grace of God the ministry of the Word has been intrusted; it is to afford all possible assistance to the devout proclamation of the Word which alone is penetrating; it is to hinder in the most earnest manner the making of the Divine Word void, and to give the Church every opportunity freely to develop her strength on the basis of the Word. The State that sets itself against the Church and her faith, that nourishes and promotes the spirit of unbelief, yea, that just wants to be indifferent, without religion, is laboring at its own ruin, on this account indeed, because it thereby hinders piety which alone can help it to make sacred the oath, on the sacredness of which its existence depends.

Accordingly if the Church, as intrusted with the ministry of the Word, is to care for the sanctification of the oath, the question arises, how must she on this account develop her activity, and that in the threefold manner in which she is everywhere to unfold her action; in the sermon, the catechisation and in the private pastoral ministrations? The object at which she must aim, however, dare not be this only that unintelligent, frivolous swearing and false swearing be prevented, but also that swearing be done rightly and well. But in order to treat of this in preaching, catechisation and private pastoral ministrations, we

must ourselves first become and be masters of the subject. All wavering in this matter, whether in regard to the essence of the oath or in regard to God's being satisfied with swearing, must here cripple our activity and make it fruitless. Not even the existing circumstance that swearing is performed, can we at once accept as one desired by God, especially since its scripturalness is contested.

We must therefore in the first place consider the question: What do the Scriptures and the doctrine of the Church say of the oath and of swearing?

1. Throughout the entire Old Testament God is revealed as swearing and the saints as building upon the oath of God. To Abraham God confirmed His promises with an oath. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel Thy servants,—prays Moses, Ex. 32, 15,—to whom Thou swearest by Thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it forever. Compare Gen. 22, 16. When the people, on hearing the report of the spies, murmured against God and His servants, and said, were it not better for us to return into Egypt? the Lord said, *surely* they shall not see the land which I swore unto their fathers. Numbers 14, 23. David sings, Ps. 110, 4: The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. To this should be added all the sworn statements in which it is said, As I live, saith the Lord. Should any one say, That is done by the Lord, is the creature thereby permitted to do it? he would be asking an idle question. For in the first place the oaths of the holy men of God are found throughout the entire Old Testament, but there is not a trace to show that God was dissatisfied with

such swearing. On the contrary, He threatens to punish false swearing only. This He does, of course, with the greatest ardor of His wrath, in the well known passages: Levit. 19, 12, Ye shall not swear by my name falsely, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: I am the Lord; Ezek. 17, 19, Thus saith the Lord God: As I live, surely mine oath that he hath despised, and my covenant that he hath broken, even it will I recompense upon his own head; Mal. 3, 5, I will be a swift witness against false swearers; Ex. 20, 6, For the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain. Would not God have forbidden all swearing, if it were displeasing to Him, as He forbade false swearing? But, on the contrary, God Himself commanded swearing, but so that it be done by Him, the Living God, and not by false gods or by the creature. "Thou shalt," so He commands, Deut. 6, 13, "thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve Him, and shalt swear by His name." As certainly therefore as it is the duty of God's servants to fear and serve Him, so certainly is it their duty also to swear by His name. As certainly as it is a divinely ordered confession of His honor to walk in the fear and in the service of God, so certainly also is His honor to be confessed by swearing by His name. But because, for all that, the Lord had to hear so many oaths among the holy people which were not a hallowing of the name of the Living God (Jer. 5, 7), He promised, Isaiah 65, 16, and comforted His saints therewith, that this also would belong to the glory of the Messianic period.

2. If we now glance into the New Testament, everything appears in the same relation, except that it has reached the stage of fulfillment. The saints praise God that He has remembered His holy covenant, and the oath

which He swore to our Father Abraham, that He would grant unto us, Luke 1, 73; that He, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, Heb. 6, 17. 18; that He also did not make the Heir a priest without an oath, in order that He might make Him a surety of a better testament than the old one was, Heb. 7, 21. So then here also God's swearing manifests itself as a confessing of us in grace on the part of God. The Heir Himself, however, justifies Himself before His people with an oath, Matt. 26; and as He thereby as the everlasting Son confesses His Father, so He also thereby confesses us, and that He is the Son of Man and that the Messianic period has appeared in Him. And even if all the testimonies of the Lord which begin, "Verily, verily, I say unto you," are not properly speaking oaths, they still indisputably have the feature of the oath.

So far now as human swearing is concerned, what Harless says must, in a general way, be granted: What the Lord, the Giver of the Law, has commanded in the Old Covenant, namely that we are to swear in His name, cannot be forbidden in the New Covenant by the Lord, the Fulfiller of the Law, without destroying the Law instead of fulfilling it. But His fulfilling it, as regards the command concerning swearing, consists in this that He gives what the Law could not give, and yet belongs to such swearing as is right and well-pleasing unto God, namely that the Law be placed into the heart and be written in the understanding, and that thus the oath become and be the confession of the heart that is converted unto God and stands in the covenant relation of faith in Him. From which it,

then, follows that only in the New Covenant the right kind of swearing can and must begin and continue. Apart from this, however, human swearing for human purposes is expressly sanctioned in Heb. 6, where it at the same time appears as the lower analogy of a higher divine relation. "For men verily swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath. Heb. 6, 16. 17. Accordingly the swearing of the holy men of God is found to enter deeply into the whole New Testament; even the heavenly messengers swearing enter with exultation of soul into the earthly congregation, Rev. 10, 6: And the angel swore by Him that liveth forever and ever, who created heaven . . . . that there should be time no longer.

Over against this summary view of the other portions of the Scriptures, as well as over against the import of swearing at which to be sure we have thus far only hinted, it must in the very outset appear impossible that the Lord (Matt. 5, 33–37, which passage is repeated in James 5, 12), whether absolutely or relatively, should nevertheless have, at all events, forbidden His people to swear. The misapprehension of this passage, however, is very old and at home not only among the sects, but has, both in the most ancient as in the most recent times, its advocates within the Church, of whom some may otherwise pass for authorities.

If Justin, Irenaeus, Basil, Chrysostom, Jerome, Theodoret, Epiphanius, are opposed to the oath; if Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nazianzen, and Augustine, regard it as permissible at a low stage only of Christian perfection,

the reason why they do so lies as well in the misapprehension of the passage under consideration, as in the wrong understanding of the import of the oath, not less meanwhile in the dread of doing before the heathen government the same thing that the heathen did. Later on the Church, however, unconditionally sanctioned the oath, and we shall presently see that the Church of the Reformation has also done so, and has rightly understood, in its essential features, the statement of the Lord in the Sermon on the Mount. Only in the most recent times is another explanation of the passage obtaining a foothold in the sphere of exegesis. The words μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως, says Meyer, forbid all swearing, not only that which is in conflict with the fear of God. Christianity as it should be according to the ethics of Christ, must not know any oath at all. Swearing by God is indeed not expressly mentioned in the following verses, but the prohibition of it is the basis and presupposition of all the points referred to. Yea, in verse 37 he explains the words ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστιν as equivalent to: it is sinful. So von Gerlach: all swearing is forbidden; and by no means is the prohibition confined by the words, Neither by heaven, etc., to swearing by creatures; rather, You must not swear at all, not only not by God, but also not by heaven, which Christ adds for the reason that such oaths were not regarded as oaths in the full sense of the word, and therefore also did not apparently come under the command forbidding swearing. Nevertheless, he says immediately afterwards, the oath *per se* can be nothing wrong. Schmid says in his *Ethics:* The New Testament statement, Matt. 5 and James 5, absolutely forbid the oath. The words μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως are not exhausted by the examples which follow, but only elucidated, and the prohibition is made because the oaths men-

tioned are also oaths before God. Jesus, therefore, on principle declares them to be inadmissible. But to be sure in such a mixed condition as we now are in, the oath is often a less evil than the production of mutual distrust. The oath is therefore not to be condemned under all circumstances. Still it remains nothing but a necessary evil. All the more certainly is it the duty of Christians to labor to bring about a state of affairs in which all swearing is dispensable.

We would be in a sad plight, if this explanation were the correct one. For apart from the fact that then the Scriptures would both command and forbid the same thing, also apart from the fact that this prohibition would be only a phantom in the air, and therefore useless, for ideal conditions we have not, nor can we hope for them in this world: what Christian could then have a good conscience—and only with such can we labor successfully—in aiding a thing which is forbidden by the Lord, and is in itself sinful, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, which is indeed a necessary evil, but still an evil.

But the misunderstanding of the Lord's statement soon manifests itself, if we consider the contradiction between the explanation referred to and the connection of the whole passage. The Lord turns from the mere outward conception of the Law to the spiritual, whereby the import of the command is necessarily lightened. As accordingly the Law is not fulfilled by not killing, not committing adultery, so also not by not swearing falsely, not even by performing the oath unto God. But citizens of the kingdom can satisfy the command in no other way than by entirely abstaining from all swearing by which the command, "Thou shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths," is violated or transgressed. Now as the Lord in connection with the other command-

ments mentions those things in which the commandment is especially transgressed, as in the case of the V. by being angry and that of the VI. by lusting after the wife of another,—so He also does in regard to the command: Thou shalt swear by the name of the Lord Thy God, which, like the others, continues to stand unshaken. This is proved by the different oath-formulas cited in the passage, which all and singular do not bear the character of a confession, that is, of a calling upon the living God. Concerning these the Lord says: *Μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως*, do not swear according to them at all. Whoever uses such trivial oath-formulas, breaks the commandment and displays an ungodly disposition, over against which among the citizens of the kingdom the simple Yea and Nay must serve as an expression of sincere truthfulness. The same is true of the passage in the Epistle of St. James, which in a general way is only a repetition of the passage in Matthew.*

Hence this word of the Lord in Matthew is not only in harmony with the remainder of the Scriptures, but also belongs in an eminent degree to the fulfillment of the Law. The command, Thou shalt swear by His name is thereby established. Bengel's words are to the point: This in general refers to both false and true swearing, but it does not forbid the true oath altogether. . . . Certainly a thing is not prohibited when the abuse, having become wide spread, is removed, and the right use is restored.

3. The doctrine of the Church is also in harmony with the teaching of the Scriptures. Article 16 of the Augustana says "that Christians may lawfully take an oath when the magistrates require it." This is repeated word for word in

* Thus far we have been translating literally. The remainder of the article is a very free translation.

the Apology. The Larger Catechism says: "It is commanded (in the second commandment) to use the name of God in behalf of the truth and of everything good, as namely when one swears correctly, if it is necessary and is required." "From this view it is easy to solve the question, with which many teachers have perplexed themselves: Why is it forbidden in the Gospel to swear, when at the same time Christ, St. Paul, and other saints have frequently sworn? This is briefly the meaning: No one should swear to wicked things, that is, to falsehoods, and in cases in which it is unnecessary; but in allowable cases and for the benefit of our neighbors we should make oath; for it is really a good deed, through which God is praised, truth and justice established, falsehood suppressed, the parties reconciled, obedience exhibited, and contentions settled. For here God Himself interposes, and discriminates between justice and injustice, good and evil. But if one party swear falsely, they have their sentence, that they shall not escape punishment." Book of Concord, N. M. Ed., p 447. And the Formula of Concord counts among the false doctrines of the Anabaptists the fact that they teach that a Christian cannot, with a good conscience, take an oath, nor promise fealty to his prince or sovereign with an oath.

If now we look at the passages of Scripture as a whole, in order to determine the essence of the oath and of swearing, the same manifests itself as an act of holy confession. The person swearing confesses his faith in the God who has revealed Himself in the Bible, in the omniscient Judge and Savior of the world, so that every oath taken appears as a response to the oath with which God has confirmed His promises to us and on which our salvation is dependent. But to this general meaning must be added the special one, through

which the oath is distinguished from asseveration and from Christian confession in general, that the person swearing, according to the demand made upon him, makes God, the highest Judge, a witness of his veracity, and expressly and solemnly renounces all claim on the grace of God, in case he swears falsely or fails to fulfill his own words. According to this swearing is primarily and chiefly an act of spiritual life, which God demands among men to the glorification of His name and to His honor, and from which man must not flee, but perform it with a fervent and joyous spirit, if he is called upon to do so, and if he can recognize such summons as coming from God. With respect to this side of the question the import of the oath is of the greatest possible intensity. The man who is called before the face of the almighty and all-knowing God to testify as it were to his heart's faith in the face of God, binds himself most intimately to God through his oath, and this binding of himself becomes and remains to him a tie out of which either streams of blessings trickle down to him—for whoever confesses the Lord with a sincere heart, him the Lord will also confess—or else it will prepare him for the crushing curse that will fall upon his head from the insulted majesty of God. Spiritually considered, God could not give man a means by which to bring in a more mighty manner the faith, begotten of the Word, to brilliant coördinations, and in a holier manner to bind the conscience to the truth and fidelity and to secure it against lying, but also to lay upon him in a swifter manner the judgment of the faith offered by the Word, if rejected by him, than this is done by the oath.

This spiritual import remains the prevailing one, even if the oath is, for the most part, used for human, that is, civil purposes. The right so to use it we have given to us

in Heb. 6, 16; and this justifies itself in the fact, as Sartorius says, that "fidelity, faith, and conscientiousness have no other firm foundation among men, than their faith-fidelity which is the inmost bond of all their relations. The thought therefore at once suggests itself to men confirming faith in their word who doubted by means of their faith in God's true Word, or to verify their word through their faith, that is to swear. As certainly therefore as God Himself demands a sworn corroboration of human statements, and as certainly as there are human bearers of divine power and order upon earth, just so certainly are these, namely the judge and all government, also authorized and in duty bound, for the ends for which they are appointed, in God's stead and in His name, to summon man before the highest, omniscient Witness and Judge of the intents and thoughts of the heart, there, as in the presence of God, to demand the testimony of the faith of the heart, in order thus to obtain the greatest possible assurance that nothing but the pure truth and the real thoughts of the heart are stated and promised. Thus, then, through the oath there will be an end of all strife. Therefore the oath has a civil as well as a spiritual import. This consists in the fact that our general obligation toward our neighbor to keep the truth and faith plighted to him, is lifted to the greatest height through this that the person speaking and promising, confidently and consciously placed before the eyes of God, bring his neighbor, the Omniscient Himself witnessing the transaction, a pledge of his faithfulness and truthfulness, than which none can be higher, holier or more binding. As therefore according to this side of the subject the correctly sworn oath serves to bind men together in a most sacred manner, so, on the other hand, nothing can

more radically and hopelessly separate men from one another, than the profanation of the oath.

If we, for the present, confine this profanation to perjury in the strict sense, we must regard it as a breach of a sworn, God-pleasing promise, or as a lie under a sworn asseveration of the truth. As regards its guilt we must take into consideration the two relations which the oath sustains to God and to one's neighbor, the spiritual and the civil guilt, sin and crime. Since the person swearing is placed in the presence of God whom he makes the witness and judge of his statement and vow, and before whom he lays down as a pledge of his fidelity the gracious communion established between himself and the Lord, perjury accordingly appears as a dastardly offense against the person of God Himself, as the extreme rupture of the fear of God and as the most wanton despising of the gracious communion with Him, which one nevertheless hypocritically confesses —a specifically terrible sin, to which the Holy One, who will not suffer Himself to be mocked, cannot otherwise respond than with an all-crushing curse upon the head of the perjurer, which must, even if it be by a slow process, devour his joints and marrow, his heart and all his senses. And as the person swearing by his sworn statement lays down before his neighbor the highest pledge of his righteousness, fidelity and truth, perjury is accordingly the utter destruction of all bonds of communion, the most fatal annihilation of all righteousness, fidelity and truth. The perjurer does not murder men so much as he murders righteousness, fidelity and truth themselves, and becomes the most horrible foe of the whole human family whom the latter has the greatest right to avoid and to punish with bonds and exile, as one guilty of the most heinous crimes

against its most sacred possessions, as one worse than pestilence.

If now we inquire further how the Church is to labor to bring about the right kind of swearing, and to prevent ignorant, careless and false swearing, that must be looked at as in general serving this purpose because preparing the way for it, which is concerned about removing everything that has been and is still exerting a crippling, destructive influence, especially at present, on piety, obedience to God and the confession of God. In this connection it must not be forgotten that our present conditions did not grow up suddenly as in a night, but have fallen from the worm-eaten tree as slowly ripened and well nurtured fruits. I am thinking chiefly of the Church in so far as it is gathered from among men and is served by men, and I do not hesitate to throw the blame chiefly, almost exclusively, upon it for our present condition in reference also to the profanation of the oath. In the rationalistic doctrine which has been so long furnished, nourished and favored by the Church, and through which the word of Holy Scripture is degraded to the level of a common human production; in the doctrinal works, the catechisms, which have been given into the hands of the people by the Church, and which have been and are yet permeated by the poison of eudemonism, according to which only that is evil and forbidden which injures and troubles men, whilst that is good and therefore commanded by God which is useful to men themselves:—in these things lie chief sources of our present conditions and of our sad inheritance which is ever sinking deeper and deeper into satanic depths. Out of them have grown the mistrust, the despising of Holy Writ, and the utter rejection of it as the Word of God; the belittling of

sin and the denial of its course, if only it brings no injury before the human judge, and finally the denial of a judgment to come and of eternal retribution—all things which, as they destroy the entire man, make true swearing impossible, and false swearing easy. Against these things, that is, against the attacks on the divinity of the Scriptures, the denial of the true nature of sin, and the setting aside of judgment to come and of eternal retribution, the Church, both by tearing down and by building up, must direct its most indefatigable, considerate and earnest efforts, as against as many hindrances and destroyers of piety and of obedience to God, as ruiners of the true confession of God.

The entire activity of the ministers of the Word must therefore at present be chiefly apologetic. The time during which a mere explanation of the Word was sufficient, in which men received the Word of God, in simplicity of faith, as the Word of God, in which men yielded when the Word had spoken,—that time is long since past, simplicity itself is excommunicated. This apologetic feature we must, if possible, put into every sermon, we must at the same time consider the objections of skepticism and the attacks of enemies, state them plainly, and thoroughly, and clearly refute them. To this end we must study—study earnestly —to learn the art of true apologetics. At all times, also in occasional conversations, we must be ready to marshal a powerful force of arguments against well pointed objections; apologetics must, as it were, have permeated our flesh and blood. Whoever has received the gift of stating his thoughts in writing, must use it—put it on interest—with the full intention of winning the field from the foe with holy zeal. With open visor the enemy is standing upon the conquered field, and claims to have a right in the

house of God; with open visor we must proceed against him, but in the love of the shepherd who seeks the lost with gentleness, reverence and a good conscience, as persons who know that there is here a breach for the Church to repair which the Church itself has made. We must do this to the end that faith in God's Word may be reinstated, and that the menaced and erring souls may again be reached with the Word. Piety must grow and obedience to God must increase, if the Word of God is again to occupy the place which it deserves in the souls of the people. So also must the doctrine concerning the Word of God be taught, with great emphasis and diligence, in the catechetical instructions; in connection therewith fervent prayers are to be offered up. The examinations of the catechumens must make accurate and thorough inquiries about this doctrine, so that the skillful testimony, given in the time of youth, may be indelibly impressed upon the heart and conscience.

(*To be concluded in next No.*)

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long sin felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope though for the present special attention will be given to the controverted subject of predestination.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are $2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. I.

		PAGE.
1.	LUTHERAN UNION, by Prof. M. Loy	1
2.	THE TWO TESTAMENTS IN THE ONE REVELATION, by G. H. Schodde, Ph. D	19
3.	PAPER RESOLUTIONS, by Prof. C H. L. Schuette	32
4.	THE TREATMENT OF THE OATH IN THE SERMON, IN CATECHISATION, ETC., by Prof. A. Pflueger	47

Monies Received for Volume VI.

Rev. F. W. C. Wiechers, Rev. N. Oefstedahl, Rev. O. H. Lee, each $4.00, Rev. F. Schulz, Rev. C. F. W. Brecht, Andrew Simon, Rev. E. Smith, C. Nagel, Rev. G. W. Lose Rev. L A. Gottwald, D. D., Rev. A. G. P. Ebert, Lewis Heyl, Rev. J. M. Asbeck, H. T. Lerdall, Rev. L. F. Meyer, L. Hammann, C. Gayman, Rev E. Cronenwett, Rev. H. J. Reimann. Rev. P. G. Schmogrow, Rev. H. F. Belser, Rev. O. S. Oglesby, Rev. J. Beck, Rev. J. O. Hoffman, Rev. J. Bauch, Rev. Wm. Schmidt, Rev. H. L. Ridenour, Rev. G. T. Cooperrider, Rev. K. Hemminghaus, Rev. G. H. Wenzel, Rev. B. E Kemmer, Rev. S. Schillinger, Rev. P. S. Swinehart, Rev. J. M. Meissner, Rev. L. A. Gottwald, Rev. E A. Born, Rev B. J. Muus, Rev. L. H. Burry, Rev L. Vogelsang, Rev. E. Gerfen, Rev. C. H. Rohe, Rev. H. J. Schuh, J. Oefstedahl, Rev. G. P. Mueller, Rev. M. C. Hecht, each $2.00, B Derschau $4.50, Rev. M Holseth $1.35, C. A. Aubol, S. Winkler, W. F. Brecht E. R. Bailey, each $1 00, Rev. J. M. Ness, O. Syftestad, each $6.00, Rev. E. Belfour $8.00, Rev. G. Dillman $3 00.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. VI.—No. II.

APRIL, 1886.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1886.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VI. APRIL, 1886. No. 2.

THE GENESIS OF FAITH.

I.

Before entering into the discussion of our subject proper we deem it advisable to call attention to a few matters preliminary to it. These having a direct bearing on the substance of our theme, a brief notice of them here cannot fail to be of service to us farther on. We have reference, first, to the ground in which the Christian faith is produced and brought to fruition; and, secondly, to the means of its production and propagation. To the observer who would at all intelligently note the planting of faith and follow up through its several stages the advances it makes toward maturity, some knowledge of the spiritual man, that is, of the man within us, is indispensable. It is necessary that he be equipped with correct views concerning the created or organic constitution of the inner man, and that he rightly understand also his present moral condition as it is by nature. In addition to this the investigator needs a proper insight into the nature, the power, and the mode of operation of those means which the great Author and Finisher of faith employs to carry out His gracious work. Such knowledge, to be at all certain, must in most of its parts be derived from the Word of God, and with this what-

ever is from other sources must be in strict keeping. Moreover, such knowledge is neither acquired nor can it be applied to any degree of correctness, except by way of personal experience.

The living spiritual organism into which the faith-producing power is introduced, and wherein it is made to operate, is

THE HEART;

for, as St. Paul says: with the heart man believeth unto righteousness. Rom. 10, 10. To the heart the Scriptures ascribe thought and understanding, grief and joy, desire and wish, intent and purpose, accusation and approbation, in short, every affect and effect of which the human soul is capable, the mysterious activities of conscience not excluded. (See e. g. 1 John 3, 19–24; etc.) From this it would appear that in the sense of Scripture language the heart is the sum-total of all those faculties of which the human mind is the undivided and indivisible entity; or that heart is the synonym of mind, so that these words are employed interchangeably to denote the same thing with this slight difference in some passages, it may be, that the former points rather to the cognitive and the latter to the motive powers. The heart is therefore the center of life and motion, the *vis viva*, as it were, of the inner man through which he is moved and moves, the seat of all his capabilities passive and active, and hence the source whence all his words and works proceed. Accordingly, an action with the heart, a hearty action, is one in which the intellect, the sensibility and the will do all participate; and participate each one in such measure and proportion as by right belong to it, considered both intrinsically and with reference to the character of the object to which the mind's activity is at the time directed.

The statement, then, that with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, calls attention to the fact that the faith unto righteousness is the joint action of all our mental faculties; and it moreover strongly suggests the other, to-wit, that in this faith-action the mind is to put forth each and every one of its powers with all the energy it can command. With the heart, with the whole heart, a man can be said to believe unto righteousness only then when he knows that righteousness with all his power of knowing, is sensible of it with all his power of feeling and wills it with all his power of volition. A man is certainly not to believe in God with an energy and force of soul less fervent and full than that wherewith he is required to love his God. Now as by the Law he is to love Him, so by the Gospel is he to believe in his God with all the heart, and with all the soul, and with all the mind, and with all his strength. This to do the grace of God invites him and the holiness of God commands him; whence Luther also interprets the first commandment to say that we should fear and love not only but also to trust God above all things. Besides, in the gospel of faith is the law of love to be satisfied.

When in John 2, 3, the Savior says: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent," it would appear as though Christianity were wholly a matter of the intellect. Then when in Matt. 5, 6, He declares that "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be filled," it seems to be an affair principally of the feeling. But just as much does he make it an object for the will when in Matt. 11, 12, He says: "The kingdom of God suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." To do justice to all these utterances, the only conclusion possible

is this, that subjective Christianity is a matter which calls for the full exercise of all the powers of the soul. This truth, and it is one of the utmost practical importance, the unbiased Christian perceives almost intuitively and accepts as self-evident. That it has ever and again been questioned and frequently denied, is entirely due to a false metaphysics which at different times has found a favorable hearing within the Church; and the latter, beguiled by its subtle charms, has in consequence suffered an amount of evil beyond all computation. Whether the lessons, which bitter experience has repeatedly taught, as history attests, are also everywhere taken to heart, is more than doubtful.

It stands to reason that if in the complex action of faith one or the other of the mental factors entering into its composition be estimated either too high or too low, a false cism of some sort is sure to creep in together with all its corrupting, schismatising and soul-destroying consequences. Thus, for example, can the correctness of the faith be secured to man only through the avenues of his intellect; but when the intellect on that or some other account is exalted to the disparagement of the other powers, then a dead orthodoxy is unavoidable; and from this to a vulgar rationalism and thence to infidelity there are but a few short steps. It is the special office of the feeling to receive into itself and then to diffuse throughout the chambers of the soul the life of the faith, that is, the quickening and comforting power of saving and sanctifying grace; but when the man within is treated as though he were all feeling, so to speak, the error leads to a vague and ever varying mysticism, which again in theory is apt to run out into pantheism while in practice it often leads to despair or to religious insanity. Without a due participation in it of

the will, no action of the mind can be said to have any moral worth and stability; but whenever the will is allowed too much sway, then an intolerant and intolerable dogmatism is the inevitable result, and one in which there is likely to be as little of truth as of reason. If a well balanced mind is of paramount importance in the common affairs of this life, much more is it in those which pertain to God and things eternal, that is, in matters of the Christian faith. To secure it the mind must, among other things, see to it that it preserve its true balance also when it makes itself the object of its own speculation.

With the heart man believeth unto righteousness; but the man and the heart of which the Apostle so affirms are not the natural man and heart. The natural man, as we have seen and may infer from the excellent powers with which he has been endowed, is a very life-full and active being; and with respect to the things of earth he has the power to believe materially as well as formally. Not so as to the things of heaven. With regard to these he has only the power to act according to the latter mode, and if at all according to the former it is wholly negative. When he does believe in the things of God, his faith is indeed his own heart's action; but it is no action to which the heart by any device or power of its own can set itself in motion. By virtue of his creation as a moral being he received, and there still remains to him, the mental organism necessary to faith-action; but this, by the introduction of sin into it, has been rendered worse than useless for the higher purposes of its bestowal. Of himself and by any of his own powers the natural man can not even know the true God, much less believe in Him and worship Him in holy love. He is born an unbeliever, and he is an enemy to everything

godly. His heart is utterly averse to every holy motion, and it resists every effort made from without to awaken such motions. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 2, 14. He is flesh born of flesh, and the flesh lusteth against the Spirit. In a word: the faith is nothing innate to the heart, neither is it a spontaneous growth there, nor the product of some natural power from any source or of any sort whatsoever. It is a growth that springs up from seed divine, by God's own planting, and to which He, as the good Husbandman, gives all the increase.

Than the doctrine, that the Christian faith is entirely the work and gift of God, no other is more clearly and unmistakably set forth in the Scriptures. "For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Phil. 2, 13. "And by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Eph. 2, 8. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." 1 Pet. 1, 23. Passages such as these and of the same import might be multiplied to a considerable number. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. Rom. 10, 17. Here

THE WORD

is designated as the divine means of its creation and bestowal. It is the Word in the fullest sense of the term, that is, including the Law and the Gospel, the Word visible and audible. "For by the law is the knowledge of sin,"—Rom. 3, 20 and chap. 7—and it "was our schoolmaster to

bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." Gal. 3, 24. But unto Christ we come not until we hear the Word of truth, even the Gospel of our salvation—Eph. 1, 13 — or unless we are engrafted into Him by the washing of water with the Word in holy Baptism. See Col. 2, 12; John 3, 5; and Tit. 3, 5.

Now this Word is in every way sufficient to accomplish the purposes of Him who gives it, and who is the Author and Finisher of our faith. It is the truth and the power of God, the bearer of the riches of His grace, and the means of His personal self-communication. "Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy Word is truth," says the Son to the Father when making intercession for His disciples. John 17, 17. And to these He says: "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life;" and they answer: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." John 6, 63 and 68. To the Christians at Rome St. Paul writes: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." Cap. 1, 16. Again: "I am sure that when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ." Cap. 15, 29. And St. John writes in his first Epistle: "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that you also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ." Cap. 1, 3. Comp. John 14, 23.

In order the better to understand how faith and everything that is antecedent and consequent to it can be wrought in the hearts of men by the instrumentality of this Word, we will do well to look more closely at the several properties here predicated of it. The first and chief among them is its divinity. "I am thy Lord thy God": such is the ulti-

mate ground, and is the leading principle of all its utterances. And there is in these few and simple words a majesty of power and a power of majesty which far surpasses anything we can understand, or could in its fulness endure. This their transcendent weight of glory they derive from the fact that He who utters them is a living personal reality, is the Lord God by the breath of whose voice things spring into being and pass away according to His pleasure. A man may laugh with safety at the menaces of a weakling foe, and he can derive little support from the hands of a helpless friend: but let friend and foe to him be men of superior strength, and he will take courage at the smile of the one and quail beneath the frown of the other. Because in His hands are life and death, because He is able to lift up into heaven and to cast down into hell, therefore are the words of the Lord so quick and powerful, and on that account are His gracious promises to be implicitly trusted and are the threats of His righteous displeasure dreadful above all things.

And His Word is truth. Truth, not as there is truth also in empty forms and lifeless figures, or in the laws of thought and in the hollow abstractions of reason; for were it nothing better than this, then might it bring information and work conviction, but it were information and conviction only of ideas which lack all reality and of shadows to which there is no substance. Then too were it powerless to give life or to take it, to acquit or to accuse, to enrich or to impoverish, to gladden or to grieve, or in any such way materially to affect the souls of men. But no, it is the truth as it pertains to God and to men, and to events and things such as are of vital interest to humanity both for this life and for the life to come. It is truth the most real and

substantial; and this all the more because it is freighted with much wherof it makes proclamation. Never were threats and promises more real and certain of execution than are the threats made and the promises given in the divine Word. The things eternal of which it speaks are in it, and through it they are placed before us, so that by accepting or rejecting the Word, we accept or reject the substance of it, that is, God Himself and the good things of God.

Such in the general outline of its most prominent features is the Word, God's faith-producing instrument. To reason merely from its many excellent qualities one might suppose that for man to believe it were but necessary to hear it, so very great is it in might and rich in blessing. The conclusion is a very reasonable one, and that it is not always verified in life is due to factors and facts not taken into consideration in the reasoning. But everything considered, even then does it remain a dread mystery why every hearer of the Word is not made a believer to it. We are informed that our good Lord Himself marveled at the unbelief of some who heard His words and witnessed His miracles.

It will be found that to every truth of God's Word the devil has in readiness a whole list of lies to oppose its light and life-giving influence. Now while the truth with superior might solicits the inner man unto belief, lie and lies with the power of many victories both in and behind them entice him not to yield to the truth. That the truth should be such as to necessitate him to believe, is wholly out of the question since faith is essentially also an action of the will; and hence, being ethical in its nature, it can not and dare not be forced. From these observations it is evident that

the process witnessed in the genesis of faith is in its nature a struggle, the prize being the possession of the soul. Engaged in it on the one hand is the soul's Creator and Redeemer, the Giver of light and life; and on the other, the prince of darkness and death, her enemy and whose captive she is. What part the soul herself takes in the conflict, how much active and how much passive, remains to be seen. Here it may suffice to state that where faith is brought about, she is led from the most unnatural sympathy with her captor to a state of safety and satisfaction on the side of her Deliverer.

Before we direct our attention to the main point of inquiry, as it now presents itself, an explanation which we deem necessary may find a place here. We firmly believe not only that by Holy Baptism faith is bestowed on infants, but also that the faith given them and the faith produced in the adult by conversion are in the essence of their origin, nature and effect one and the same thing. However, since faith is awakened in the infant at a time of life preceding intelligent consciousness and reflection, it is impossible for us to know anything particular and definite of the mode in which its soul is moved and moves when the infant is made a believer. The little we can know of the mode of this change is by reasoning *a posteriori*, and the conclusions then arrived at are anything but certain. Now the question involved in our theme is preeminently one of life and whose solution is therefore derived to a great extent from a conscious personal experience and not from speculation. This explains why the planting of faith by infant baptism can find but little consideration here. The personal subject of the investigation is necessarily the adult man and hearer of the Word.—That days may suffice to produce faith, and

again that years may pass away before the work is accomplished, it is hardly necessary to state.

The different and successive stages through which the heart is made to pass as it is led forth from unbelief to faith are, *first and mainly by the Law:* a right knowledge of God and His holy will, and with it a knowledge of self and of its own moral condition, thence a conviction of the truth acquired and a sense of guilt, then fear and pain and sorrow, and upon these a longing for deliverance and an anxious inquiry after it; *secondly, and chiefly by the Gospel:* an inner knowledge of Christ and His work, then an explicit belief in the truthfulness of the work and Word of grace, and lastly the appropriation to itself in confidence of Christ and His salvation. The question how such actions and changes are effected in the heart, shall now engage our attention. To this end we must first examine into that part of the work which takes place in

THE HEART UNDER THE LAW,

the law which it is to itself, (Rom. 2, 14,) and the law that is given to it in the Decalogue.

We have seen in our brief survey of the inner man how thoroughly the Creator has endowed him with all the organic powers necessary to perform such functions as enter into faith. But besides that did we remind ourselves of the dire fact that with respect to spiritual things all these faculties have, by the poison of sin, become utterly corrupt. With regard to the things of God and as for them, the eyes of the mind are closed, the feelers of the heart's sensory are blunted and the muscular fibers of the will are completely shattered. Such being the case it is an intricate problem to understand how the mind can be at all affected by things to

receive and favor which it has become so thoroughly inert and to which it is even bitterly opposed. By faith man is indeed to become a new creature; but a new creature with the old organism retained and intact. Some light is thrown on this mystery when we remember the fact that to the sinner even in his worst condition there remains, as all history testifies, a certain innate and irradicable consciousness of something which he calls God. Indefinite and feeble though this is, sleep as it may for days and years, still it is there; and this is of the very greatest importance. It is the hinge, so to speak, into which the finger of the Holy Ghost may link itself in order to draw the sinner back to his God.

The spirit of man is descended from God in a way more immediate and direct by far than that by which any other creature of earth is come forth from Him. Then too has his Creator placed him into a relation much closer to Himself, so that he is not only wholly dependent on but also forever accountable to his Maker. His spirit besides is so constituted that it can have no rest and be satisfied with no joy unless it rest and joy in Him who gave it. (See Gen. 2, 7 and 1, 26–28.) Ungodly though man is become, the impress of the divine hand that formed him is not entirely wiped out. Far though he may have and has strayed from his Father's house, a vague sense of his estrangement and lost condition does make itself felt now and then. Do what he will, he can add nothing to his stature or his life beyond what is allotted to him; and he knows it and often regrets it though he may be unwilling to acknowledge it. He may feed his soul with the best things of earth, and there remains a void that nothing can fill and which at times becomes painful beyond endurance. Let him do what he knows to be wrong—he has such knowledge

—, and in the deep of his heart he feels the worse for it; but all the better for doing what he thinks to be right; and this, because by every wrong-doing he is led away and by every well-doing he is brought nearer to his God, be it by a step never so small. Account for the mysteries of it as best we can, such is the undeniable experience of all mankind; and this establishes beyond all reasonable dispute that fallen man is somewhat conscious of the existence of a being higher than himself and the world around him, and on whom he and his kind are dependent and to whom they are responsible for their life's doings. With his lips the one or the other may deny it, as many very many do, and so harden himself to its reality; but the truth remains, and all personal sense of it as a truth most real no man can shake off, do what he will. Neither is his notion of such a being ever entirely formal or wholly an ideal one. It is true that upon the whole the substance of his conceptions is for the most part imaginary and delusive, but the chief element, the belief in a supreme being of some kind, is never entirely destroyed or expelled from it—and this does duty as a surrogate for the true God until He Himself shall come to take its place.

When now to the inner man with eyes obscured almost to blindness, but yet they are eyes, the divine Majesty appears, and when into his ears strongly impaired as they are the Holy One of heaven cries with a voice as of thunder: I am the Lord thy God! how can even he, blear-eyed and deaf though he is, fail to see in somewhat a vision of such transcendent brightness, and to hear a truth so loud and clear, and not know who speaks nor what is spoken? How can he fail so to see and hear, as he should, when by the vision and voice present to him there are awakened in

the depth of his soul the slumbering reminiscences that, at a time he knows not when and at a place he knows not where, he has beheld and heard something of the kind before, the one perhaps its shadow, and the other its echo, it may be! And then, when the voice continues,—Thou shalt have no other gods before me: thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind; and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself! then how can he do otherwise but say within himself: Even so should I do, O Lord, but neither do nor have I the will to do? Did it seem to us a while ago impossible that man could ever believe—now it would seem impossible that he could do otherwise than believe.

The Word of God, in so far as it is intended to produce ethical results, is not an irresistible power; but in some of its functions beyond and preparatory to such results it certainly exercises a power overwhelmingly great. That something in some way be learned and felt as of God by the mind that really hears the Word, is inevitable. So the hearer, especially of the Law, receives in some degree at least a knowledge of God and of self; and he is, besides, more or less impressed with a sense of God's holiness and of his own guilt. But this knowledge and sensation have in themselves as yet no moral worth; for this latter depends entirely on the attitude which the will assumes, or is moved to assume, toward the knowledge acquired and the feelings produced. What action the will is likely to take it is not hard to foretell so long as we conceive it to act on impulses due to man's corrupt nature; for to this the truth learned is a most bitter and mortifying one. Naturally then man will reject the information so thoroughly repugnant to himself, and do his best to rid himself of feelings so strange

and offensive to his flesh. Should he persist in his opposition to the holy voice that has come to him, he will surely come to grief, yea, perish in it; for "the letter killeth;" whereas if he yields then may he live, for "the Spirit quickeneth." Many however persist in their resistance; with such we have nothing further to do; they are lost.

As to him, however, whom we expect to see restored, what is there that could induce him to act against himself as he is and likes to be, and to act for himself as he should be and should want to be—what is there that shall induce him to die the death from which are the issues of life everlasting? Certainly there is nothing in the bitterness of the words that have been addressed to him, neither is there anything in himself or in the world and the devil, his evil abettors, that can move him to give himself up to the truth. Nay more than that, the revelations of the Law in so far as they denounce him and his ways, are in a manner calculated to enrage him, and all the more the more boldly he faces them; even as St. Paul says: "But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence; for without the Law sin was dead." Rom. 7, 8 et seq. So very desperately wicked and deceitful above all things is the human heart, that the strife soon were ended were it not for Him who has brought it on and who is fully equal to His underaking. Will the man of sin not yield? neither will the Holy One against whom he arrays himself.

Having opened to some extent the eyes of his adversary and unstopped his ears, the Lord God is determined to prosecute the advantages thus far secured. To do it with strong prospect of success, He is well equipped. "Is not my Word like as a fire, saith the Lord, and like a hammer that breaketh the rock to pieces? Gen. 24, 29. To this, one

who has tested its efficiency, makes answer: "The Word of the Lord is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Heb. 4, 12. Then let the sinner in the blindness and perversity of his heart do what he can to assure himself; let him say to himself a thousand times and a thousand times more cry it out to others, "There is no God that I could offend Him; and there is no death and no hell that I should fear them"—all in vain! That no perfect security and rest are found in that direction, of that He will take care, who now has come upon him. As man is unable by any reason and power of his own to arrive at a full certainty that God is an avenger of sin, no more can he by any efforts of his own, much though he would like to, become fully assured that God is not, and that eternal death and woe are not; and least of all is this possible when once he hears the voice and feels the displeasure of God whose very being he endeavors to deny. In reason atheism has no foundation whatever; it has nothing to support it except the lusts of the flesh and the arbitrary and obstinate determination of a godless will.

The heart therefore, placed under the Word of God as we now contemplate it, that will not be convinced of what it hears and can not be assured to the contrary, is in a terrible condition. The hammer of God bears down on it, His hands have kindled a fire within that is not of this earth, and from without it is pierced by the sword of His Spirit. What will the effect be—what will the unhappy heart think of it and say of it, not as moved by anything that is its own but as moved by powers from God?

The very fact that the heart hearing the Law is troubled

at the sound of it, is an evidence that with the knowledge a state of doubt if not of conviction has set in. Things pleasant or painful can in no way affect our minds unless known to us; and when made known, they can neither please nor pain us so long as we hold the information to be utterly false. But just as soon as doubts arise, and these are the first steps to conviction pro or con, that soon are we moved to fear or hope, pain or pleasure. And thus we have every reason to believe that the obstinate sinner, all his loud talk to the contrary notwithstanding, is not in a state of settled conviction but of unsettled doubt with regard to the things proclaimed by the Law. Felix the adulterer trembled as Paul reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come. Why did the mighty heathen tremble? because he had led astray the wife of another? No, because to the doers of such things there was a judgment to come, and because he could not withstand the truth of its announcement. Such truth and force of truth there is in all God's Words; and it will create and foster doubts and convictions of some sort in all who give ear to it, do what they will. But such a conviction as this is, and which forces itself on the mind as the one that two and two are four, is not the conviction purposed by the Law of God. It is not the conviction of a broken and a contrite heart such as God is pleased with. To be that, the heart must willingly assent to the divine truth presented to it.

To learn, as best we can, how the will may be shaken in his arrogant, would-be-God disposition, be brought down and be made to look up to heaven and say: "My Lord and my God!"—how against his own wicked nature and despite his self-conceit he can be led to acknowledge that the Lord is holy, right and just in all His demands, and thus con-

demn himself—to understand this, we must look at a feature of the Law not yet taken notice of. For to say, in answer to the question how by the Word repentance is wrought? that that Word is the light and power of God, is perfectly correct; but it explains nothing, and hence the question is not fairly met.

There is a side to the Law which to the sinner may at first appear as a sort of gospel. Many professed Christians even view it in that light; however, were they but to make an earnest endeavor to avail themselves of it, they would ere long see that they are badly mistaken.

The part of the Law referred to is summed up in the words found in Exodus 20, 5–6, and are familiar to us all. There God says: "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." A fearful threat and a pleasing promise are here given: the one, fearful to him who hates his God; the other pleasing to him who *can* love his God and *loves* Him. Here then we have something that is adapted not only to stir up the feelings of the soul but to urge on the will and (as it would seem) to draw it at the same time in a God-ward direction—the fear of punishment to impel it, the hope of favors to attract: fear and hope, of all moral forces perhaps among the strongest, though not always the most pure.

In the heart of the convicted sinner as he is now before us these motives are far from pure; for that, or anything near to it, he is as yet altogether too blind and sinful. Nevertheless they are awakened by divine agency, though it be in unclean chambers; and they can be of some service

to him, as mostly they are. If he be thereby moved, as he can be, to acknowledge his God and God's justice, confess himself a sinner, desire to appease the wrath he has incurred and to seek the divine favor, some advance is made. That by all this he is not as far along as no doubt he himself will think, that he has even strayed into ways that will lead him away from God and from which he must some day retrace his steps, is very true. Still there is progress to be noted; and the very mistakes made, if he be led to find them out and to profit by them, shall serve to push him forward.

From dread of God's displeasure and in fear of His mighty arm he now deplores his sinful condition; his reasons to do so are not the best, but they are better than none. He is selfishly sorry for wrong-doing; selfishly, still he sorrows. He tries to serve God for hire; yet let no one condemn him for making God a taskmaster, as long as he knows no better. In one way his heart is now broken. If neither the heart nor the pieces are much the better for it, yet is the gain to be recorded that a heart hardened by wickedness is broken and that some wickedness was destroyed by the breaking. We observe farther that now in a certain sense and to some extent the resistance of the will to God is overcome; but we must not fail to notice that the sinner has ceased to resist more for his own sake than for God's. He has surrendered, but by impulses and with a grace and for a purpose not very commendable. It is a surrender a good deal like that of the judge in the parable. He feared not God nor regarded men; still he said to himself: because this widow troubleth me I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she worry me. (Luke 18.) Then to whom shall we ascribe this action, such as it is?

To God? For that it is too bad. To the sinner? For that it is too good. To impulses coming from both is the only answer left us. Sinful man ceases resistance to God under pressure partly from himself and partly from God; and we are safe in saying that all the good in it is from above, and all the bad from below.

In this connection it may be observed, though it be a digression to do so, that the progress which a man makes on his way from sinner to saint finds its analogy not so much in the building up of an edifice as it does in the growth of a plant. In the former the fundamental part is always completed before the superstructure to it is taken in hand; while in the latter, in growth, we have a continued process of secretion and accretion throughout the whole of the plant, so that we can pluck a peach or a pear, for example, before the trunk of the tree is half grown. And so it is in the growth of faith. The order of its genesis is in the main, and as conditioned by the laws of the mind: knowledge, assent and confidence. But never is knowledge made perfect before assent sets in, nor assent before confidence is given. In short, the growth is a constant one and takes place in all the minutiae that may enter into it in the root and trunk of it as well as in its branch and leaf. The man who has been led up all the way from unbelief through the *credere Deum*, *Deo* and *in Deum*, and who is become strong in the faith is never wholly done with the *credere Deum*, nay, not even with the unbelief from which he has escaped. Grow away from unbelief and grow into and in the faith he must at all times.

By the assent of the will to the revelations of the Law the latter may be said to have secured for itself an entrance into the heart. And now for

THE LAW IN THE HEART,

but as yet not the law of the heart, a most important and arduous piece of work remains to be done. The state of conviction and of *quasi* contrition, in which we left the sinner a moment ago, is a most precarious one; and this not so much for the imperfections of his advances thus far as on account of the delusion under which he labors. As we have seen, he has set out to make his peace with God by his own efforts, that is, by personal endeavors to meet the demands of divine justice. He has thus entered a way that might lead him to God and heaven—past transgressions not considered—were he able to walk it. And he thinks himself able, and is rather confident of success. We know that every such effort is wholly in vain, and that the man who persists in it is sure to perish. How shall his eyes be opened, his mind be changed and his feet be led back from a way of such dreadful issue? Above all, might not this fatal misconception of the Law and of its intents and purposes have been prevented? To judge merely from theory, this might appear to be an easy matter to do; but experience teaches that it is not. The old and destructive leaven of righteousness by the Law is purged out with great difficulty and the hearts of most people are not made clean of it entirely until the angels of the kingdom are sent to sweep it out. However, a beginning must be made in this life, otherwise the soul is lost; but how? and of what service can the Law be toward it?

When a certain lawyer inquired of Christ what he must do to inherit eternal life, the Master pointed him to the Law, asking him to repeat it; which when he had done, Jesus said: *Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt*

live. (Luke 10, 25 et seq.) Here, as Luther would say, the Savior is doing Moses' work and performing offices foreign to Himself; and short and thorough work He makes of it. Do that, and thou shalt live! No better answer can be given to those who, like the lawyer, are willing to justify themselves. To say to our subject in his present condition "that what things soever the Law saith, it saith to them that are under the Law, that every mouth may be stopped and all the world may become guilty before God; therefore by the deeds of the Law shall no flesh be justified in His sight" (Rom. 3, 19–20.) would be preaching to an ear too dull for intelligent and acquiescent hearing. If at all effective, such words will arouse forces which are as yet not put down; and put down to stay they must be. To tell the unregenerate man that he is a sinner and deserving of punishment is to him a truth most humiliating and obnoxious; but to tell him that he can do nothing, nothing whatever, to redeem himself, that is more than he can endure and ninety and nine times out of an hundred he will spurn it as an intolerable lie. Still, lie though he think it, he must be taught to accept it as the truth which surely it is. Heavy beyond endurance, as in foolish pride he may esteem it, he must bear the burden of its shame. Howbeit, just at this point his entire behavior shows how very superficial up to the present is his understanding of the Law, and hence how deficient his knowledge of God and holiness, of sin and self: and thus, that his heart is as yet not so broken and contrite that the work of its restoration can be begun.

The old man of sin is now to be assailed in parts where he is most vulnerable, but at the same time most strongly fortified also. In what way can the sword of the Spirit be made to reach him, and how by the arrows of the Lord is

the heart of him to be pierced and riven, and that unto death if possible? The Master, in doing battle for Moses, has told us. Entice the foe to fall on the sword of the Spirit, to expose himself to the arrows directed at him, and victory is almost sure to fall on the side of the Lord. That is, in effect, what Jesus did to the tempting and self-righteous lawyer. "This do, and thou shalt live!" Here is a feat of strategy unequaled anywhere, and withal it is entirely truthful and benevolent. Tell the sinner who persists that he can justify himself to go on and do it (See also Luke 19, 16–22); and the more thoroughly he goes to work about it with the Law to direct him, the harder will he find his undertaking, and the sooner will he learn that by the deeds of the Law is no flesh justified. Following this conviction, and neither before it nor without it, is the sinful heart broken and contrite as far as by the Law it can be.

In his vain endeavors to justify himself the sinner has tried to know and to do what the will of the Lord is. He knows that sometimes he has failed, he thinks that in some things he has succeeded; but even in these he found that no real and abiding peace came to his soul. He has no satisfying assurance that the holy anger of God is removed from him. He is in a state of restlessness that makes life a burden, while the thought of death and of judgment strikes his soul with terrors that are maddening. Will he, now that he despairs of self-redemption, despair at once of being redeemed at all and in any way whatsoever. Hardly. Even should he know nothing of this other way,—which is not probable since he is in possession of the Word—he sees others about him who tell of salvation and who are happy; and before he gives himself up to utter despair he will cry out to the right and left: What can be done that I may be

saved? And so the Lord now has him in hand a sinner ready to be saved, anxious for and inquiring after salvation.

The work of illumination, as it is by the Law, is made full in all its parts, though the parts themselves lack much to make them perfect. The heart is penitent, it sorrows on account of its sins; and it is a sorrow which, in some measure and proportion, God has brought about; and yet it is a sorrow with which He is not pleased. Then too, the will may be said to have been brought into submission in so far that no longer attempts are made at a righteousness that were entirely the work of man; but then, this is a submission rather from exhaustion than from anything pleasureable. When therefore we speak here of such things as illumination, penitence, sorrow for sins and of submission to a certain truth of God's Word, let us not for a moment forget the agency by which they are wrought and the motives from which they spring, lest we misconceive their nature and overestimate their worth. Unless some Gospel truth have been introduced and been at work—which is contrary to our supposition—all the knowledge, emotions and volitions thus far spoken of have been derived from the Law, and hence they are legal in their nature. The sinner has now a more than natural knowledge of God and His will, and thence of self and of his own condition; but, note well, he can take no pleasure in anything he has learned, for it is wholly against him as far as he can see—it is a sentence of death and damnation to him. Again, he is sorrowful, not because he has sinned against his God, as it might seem; O no, he only bewails his sins because of the sting that is in them and which he has been made to feel. Lastly, he acknowledges his helplessness and inability to redeem himself without aid and to secure peace to his soul by anything he him-

self is able to render; but to this subjection of his will to the truth that by the deeds of the Law no flesh can be justified, he is brought more by the force of the fact than by the love of the truth; so that, though he is abased yet does he not humble himself.

In the meantime, while there is no real and positive good to speak of at this stage of his progress, let us not overlook the negative gain that has been secured. The schoolmaster for Christ has had him in charge, has labored with, yes, and thoroughly be labored him, too; he has wearied him and rendered him susceptible to higher influences. The gain to be recorded is: the pupil can be advanced and placed in charge of a more gracious Master; the sinner is made ready for grace, his heart for Christ, his ear for the Gospel!

C. H. L. S.

LUTHERAN UNION.

SECOND ARTICLE.

As long as men do not reflect upon the subject there is much plausibility in the cry, that the Bible only is the creed of Christians and that consequently nothing more is needed as a basis of union. If the Holy Scriptures alone are the source and rule of all spiritual truth, it unquestionably seems sufficient for church-fellowship that these are cordially accepted. And so it is. But that does not limit our creed to the one article that the Bible is the Word of God. The Bible contains other matter than that which pertains to its own divine origin and authority. A cordial acceptance of the Scriptures embraces their contents, not

only the authority of the Book, irrespective of those contents. The Lutheran Church acknowledges and maintains the right principle when she declares: "Unto the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments." Augsb. Conf. Art. VII. The Bible is the only authority which Christians can rightly recognize in the domain of faith. But this principle is grossly misunderstood when it is supposed to mean that Christians need no creed, or that the Bible can be itself their creed. Even those who, in most cases no doubt thoughtlessly, claim that the Scriptures are their creed and that Christians need no other, nevertheless set up a creed, narrow and shriveled indeed, but still a creed, when they ask every applicant for membership to confess as their faith that the Bible contains the truth to which they assent and by which they are governed. Such a confession must itself rest upon the authority of the Scriptures to which it pertains, and can be demanded of Christians as a condition of fellowship only upon such authority. But if we are bound to believe and confess that the Bible is divinely inspired and therefore divinely authoritative in the Church, thoughtful people will certainly be led to inquire whether that is all that this same Bible requires them to believe and confess. Is the truth in Jesus, and the precious Savior who is thus brought to our knowledge and to our hearts, not to be received upon the divine testimony borne in the Bible, or their reception not to be made a condition of fraternal fellowship in the Church? A closer examination thus evinces that the cry of no creed but the Bible, in any such sense as would exclude the necessity of confessing the truth which is contained in that Bible and for the impartation of which that

Bible was given by inspiration of God, is sheer nonsense. That what the Scriptures say is true, is indeed an essential confession, without which men could not recognize each other as Christians, and could not therefore think of uniting as subjects under the one Lord who governs His kingdom by that truth. Therefore we have endeavored, in our former article, to set out this fundamental principle and lay stress upon it as the primary condition of union. But manifestly we would not make practical account of the principle thus enunciated, if we stopped there and assumed that nothing else is requisite. The Lord's Word must not only be theoretically recognized as supreme authority, but is to be embraced and confessed and insisted upon as such among His people. "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed. For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." 2 John 9, 11. Such words of the King are not to be set aside by the magisterial dictum of ill-informed or thoughtless or indifferentistic men claiming to be His subjects.

As it is necessary not only to accept the authority of Holy Scripture, but also the truth which rests upon that authority and which makes us free, it is evident that a union acceptable to God and profitable to man can be formed only on the basis of this revealed truth. So much we should expect all intelligent Christians, if they would but give the subject a moiety of the attention which they are willing to give important interests of temporal business, readily to admit. So much at least all intelligent Luther-

ans who have been thinking of the importance of union among those of their name, will cordially admit. But that in itself does not indicate the doctrines upon which an agreement is necessary as a permanent bond of union. We cannot here enter into an extended enumeration of the articles of faith included in "the doctrine of the Gospel" to which our Confession refers, and of course not into a presentation of the grounds upon which each of these doctrines claims a place in the list. Nor do we deem this necessary for our purpose. We are speaking of union among those who claim to be Lutherans, and such a claim certainly must be presumed to imply the acceptance of at least the principal part, if not of the whole of these articles. Our question now is: What is necessary, besides the sincere recognition of the supremacy of Holy Scripture, for the union of those who desire to be classed among those Christians who are called Evangelical Lutherans? We are aware that to this not all will give the same answer. If they did, this article would not have been written. Our reply is presented in what we must insist upon as

II. The second fundamental condition of union; to wit, the cordial and unqualified acceptance of the Lutheran Confession as their own.

1. For this, in the first place, it will be needful to give a reason.

We hold this to be necessary, first, because there can be no honest and legitimate appropriation of the Lutheran name without a sincere acceptance of the thing which that name designates. Even the world agrees in condemning it as wrong when men pretend to be what they are not, and stigmatizes the proceeding by the hateful name of hypocrisy. Even the world agrees too in pronouncing it such a

wrong when a name is assumed, while the thing for which the name stands is not accepted. A man has no right to call himself a Christian while he openly rejects the Christian faith, as a man has no right to call himself a dealer in gold and diamonds when he is a peddler of pinchbeck and paste. In either case he is a deceiver. Now, the name Lutheran means something. The Lutheran Church has a distinctive name because it has a distinctive existence. As a particular organization it has its well-marked and well-known characteristics. These are not to be found in any peculiar forms or ceremonies. In such matters she is so free and liberal that she could much less be identified by them than any other church. Romanists or Baptists, for instance, might be recognized by their peculiar rites. But that is because they are sects, whose sectarian distinctions lie outside of the Gospel. From the beginning Lutherans have declared it to be their principle, that unto the true unity of the Church it is "not necessary that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies instituted by men, should be alike everywhere." No error could be more in conflict with the spirit and genius of the Reformation than that of supposing that true Lutheranism is represented wherever the beautiful service which Lutherans loved in the olden time is introduced in public worship. The Lutheran Church has existed and can still exist without such adornments. Her beautiful robe is not herself. But she cannot exist without the doctrine of the Gospel. That is her life. "Unto the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments." That is all she demands, but of that demand she can abate nothing. Nor has she left it all in doubt what she understands by the doctrine of the Gospel.

She gathered up the results of her wars and her victories in this regard, and presented them as her faith in her noble confession. By that she is distinguished from all other churches and parties claiming to be churches. What is Lutheran is thus historically well-defined. Whoever accepted the doctrine of the Gospel which the Lutherans set forth in their confession was recognized as a Lutheran, and no others could be or were acknowledged as such. Those who receive the Lutheran faith, as the Lutheran Church has herself defined it, are entitled to the Lutheran name, and those who refuse to accept it should, for the sake of common honesty, not lay claim to a name which would only misrepresent them before the world and mislead the world in regard to them, and should not be recognized if, regardless of all the demands of righteousness, they insisted on claiming it. There have been evil days in the history of the Church when men departed from the precious Lutheran faith and still dishonored the Lutheran Church by assuming her honored name. We need but refer to the dreary times of the reign of Rationalism. How much our dear Church has suffered from this source need not here be recited. But the warnings of history should not be disregarded. In this free country our hands are not tied, and we should see to it that our name be not, by recognizing those as Lutherans who refuse to accept the Lutheran Confession, tarnished by our own connivance. There are even now some outspoken Rationalists who call themselves Lutherans, as there are others who, in regard to the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church, are in open sympathy with Reformed parties, though for some reason they would rather be called Lutherans. Such persons cannot be included in a Lutheran union, because they lack that which

the Lutheran name imports and which is distinctive of the Lutheran Church.

The acceptance of the Lutheran Confession is necessary as a condition of Lutheran union, secondly, because the doctrine thus confessed is "necessary unto the true unity of the Church." Not only must those who would join together as Lutherans accept that which distinguishes Lutherans because it is thus distinctive, but we must insist on its acceptance because it is scriptural, whatever may be thought of the historical and proper signification of the name. In other words, we must insist on an acceptance of the truth as confessed in the Lutheran symbols not only because the assumption of the name implies, in common honesty, the acceptance of the thing which is thus denominated, but also because the thing thus denominated is in itself binding upon us by divine authority. For the true unity of the Church it is necessary to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel. If that which our Confessions set forth is not the pure truth of God's Word, it is not obligatory upon our consciences. In that case we should refuse to accept it as our faith, because it is dangerous to substitute the doctrines of men for the doctrines of God. But in that case it is manifest that we should also renounce the Lutheran name, the assumption of which is a participation in the crime of such displacement of God's truth by human impositions. On the other hand, if that which our Confessions teach is the very truth of the Gospel, it is obligatory upon our consciences altogether aside from the fact that Lutherans confess it. Our faith rests on God's Word, not on man's sanction of the truth which it teaches. The Lutheran Church confesses her doctrines because the Lord has revealed them as His own eternal truth, which His disciples are

bound to accept and which they are glad to receive and confess. The claims of the Lutheran Church are entirely misunderstood when it is imagined that she arrogates to herself the right to set up any conditions of membership that a body of men assuming the Lutheran name may have originally agreed upon as a bond of union. She recognizes no human right to establish articles of faith or bind ordinances upon men's consciences. She simply confesses her faith, which means that she accepts the truth which is given by inspiration of God in the Holy Scriptures, and speaks because she believes. She does not ask that a single proposition in her symbols be accepted on her authority. She accepts every article on the authority of her Lord, who speaks to her and to all men in His Word, and asks every man to accept it on the same authority. She therefore cannot admit that there is a single statement of doctrine in her creed which not all men are equally bound to accept. She has no Gospel for Lutherans only. Her Gospel is the good tidings of great joy which shall be unto all people. Certainly those are especially bound who have accepted these doctrines and given their pledge to abide by them and to maintain and defend them. But they have given such pledge simply because the voice of their Lord has been heard and heeded, and because they have believed and are now incited to confess the precious truth in Jesus which He has spoken. Her doctrine is the doctrine of the Gospel, and all men should receive and confess it. To this her distinctive doctrines form no exception. She would be one of the most miserable of sects if she admitted that what is peculiar to herself is not divine. In that case the best thing she could do would be to repent of the sin of schism and bring forth fruits meet for repentance by disbanding. She maintains

her separate existence solely because fidelity to her Lord and His Word requires her to maintain, at any cost and at every hazard, the Gospel truth which she confesses. Agreement in this doctrine is necessary unto the true unity of the Church. It is the doctrine not of a sect, but of the Gospel, which is obligatory upon the whole Church of Christ. It is the Christian doctrine, and therefore forms the true basis for the union of Christians. Evangelical Lutherans, as their name implies, are people who embrace this doctrine on the authority of God's Word, and will form a union on no other basis, because they can acknowledge no other to be divine. Hence there can be no receding from the position that a Lutheran union can be formed only on the condition that all agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel as the Lutheran Church confesses it in her symbolical books.

2. When we lay down the acceptance of the Lutheran Confession as a condition of Lutheran union it seems to us needful, in the second place, to make an explanation in regard to the nature of the requirement made, in order to set out more conspicuously what has already been implied.

It must be noted, first, that we do not ask any one to accept our Confessions for any such reason as that they, as regards the form, are divinely inspired, and are thus of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, or that the Lord has given such authority to the Church which promulgates them as to render them obligatory in a sense similar to that which attaches to the obligatoriness of laws imposed by the civil government. They are certainly not so inspired, and can therefore have no just claim to our acceptance on such ground. Their human origin is historically well known, and they themselves do not pretend to be anything more than witnesses of the truth drawn from Holy Scripture.

"The other symbols and writings cited," says the Formula of Concord, "are not judges, as are the Holy Scriptures, but only a witness and declaration of the faith, as to how at any time the Holy Scriptures have been understood and explained in the articles in controversy in the Church of God by those who then lived, and how the opposite dogma was rejected and condemned." *Epit. Intr.* 8. Neither has the Church any powers in spiritual matters such as the State has in secular. In matters subject to reason and pertaining to external order in the relations of men to each other in the community, God has delegated authority to man, and we are commanded to be "subject unto the higher powers." But the church does not deal with such things, and in regard to the things of the soul and its eternal salvation, with which she does deal, God has delegated His authority to no man. His Word, not man's reason, is the rule and standard in this domain, and for everything which the Church requires to be believed she must bring her "thus saith the Lord," before it can have any force in the court of conscience. The rule of the Lutheran Church is "that the Word of God should frame articles of faith; otherwise no one, not even an angel." *Smalc. Art*, II. 2, 15. Therefore she never required any one to accept any of her doctrines merely because she taught them. She required their acceptance, and requires it now, only because they are taught in the Word of God. The symbols have no authority aside from the Gospel whence their doctrines are drawn, and which makes doctrines binding because they are divine.

It must therefore be noted, secondly, that no one is asked or expected to accept these Confessions as long as their contents have not been recognized as the doctrine of the Gospel. They are a confession of faith, and their acceptance

presupposes the acceptance, or divine authority, of the truth which they confess. The source of that truth is the Bible, and by that the confession as well as other writings must be tested. "We believe, teach, and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing else than the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as it is written (Ps. 119, 105): 'Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my faith.' And St. Paul (Gal. 1, 8): 'Though an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, let him be accursed.'" *Form. Conc.* I. Intr. 1. Hence, if any one on the testimony of Holy Scriptures believes these doctrines, he is simply asked to confess them with us, as the Scriptures require and as his own believing heart will prompt. If any one does not on such authority receive them, he is not asked to confess them and as an honest man could not confess them with us. But of course in the latter case he could not be recognized as agreeing with us, concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and could not be embraced in a union on the basis of such agreement. Our principle means only this, in short, that as a condition of union all agree to accept and hold fast the faith which was once delivered to the saints.

3. It may be regarded as needful, in the third place, to say a few words also in regard to the reach and scope of the condition under consideration.

We remark, first, that while every member embraced in the organization is to accept the faith of the Church confessed in her symbols, without any qualifications or reservations or provisos, a difference must be made in regard to the degree of knowledge to be required of different individuals. No reasonable person would make the same demands upon

an unlearned layman, whose occupation is such as to preclude much acquaintance with books or much devotion to study, as upon a minister of the Gospel, whose calling it is to instruct the people in the truth of God and teach them the way of salvation. Of course we do not mean that the former need not believe and confess the truth of the Gospel with other Christians, or that the minister is alone to inherit our Lord's promise, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." No one is to be received into the Church and numbered among her communicants who has not learned the doctrine which the Church teaches. All must be instructed, and the Lutheran Church has made ample provision for this in her system of catechization. She requires all to confess the faith which is set forth in the Catechism, and would confirm none and admit none to communion who denied or even declined to confess any part of that faith. But whilst acquaintance with the contents of the Catechism and acceptance of the doctrine there set forth must be demanded of all, and although that will in many cases suffice, because that really embraces a summary of Christian doctrine, more than this must be required of teachers. The laboring man may be a good Lutheran without much knowledge of the Apology of the Augsburg Confession or the Formula of Concord, but it would be a burning shame for a man who professes to be a Lutheran minister to confess that he never read them. He must read them and accept them before Lutherans could with safety receive him as a teacher of the Church.

We remark, secondly, that the cordial acceptance of the Lutheran Confession requires the exercise of doctrinal discipline in congregations and synods. If Christians cannot fellowship a man who openly violates a divine command-

ment and impenitently continues in his sin, much less can they fellowship a man who openly denies a doctrine which the Lord of the Church expressly teaches, and who impenitently persists in such denial. Even the uneducated among our laity have learned this much, that "he that teaches and lives otherwise than God's Word teaches, profanes the name of God among us," for their Catechism has taught them that. If a person cannot be received into a congregation because he does not accept the truth of God, he cannot be retained in the congregation when it becomes known that he has ceased to accept the truth of God, or that he has only pretended to accept it. To continue in fellowship with such a person would render all concerned partakers of his sin. With a congregation that thus harbors and fosters an offense against the honor of the Lord, other congregations that sincerely pray and labor for the hallowing of His name can therefore not form a union. The same holds with regard to synods, which are associations of congregations confessing the same faith. A synod that tolerates doctrines in conflict with those confessed in our symbols, becomes partaker of the sin, and its lip confession of adherance to the Lutheran symbols, while it fellowships those who openly deny, or at least decline to accept them, or any part of the doctrine of the Gospel set forth in them, goes for nothing. An honest and sincere acceptance of the Lutheran Confession as the pure faith of God's Word will not silently sanction any contrary doctrine by open fellowship with those who teach and confess it, but will earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints. A Lutheran union cannot be formed with those who, whatever their professions may be, unite with others refusing to accept the Lutheran Confession. They form a union on other grounds than those which are indispensable to Lutheran unions.

4. As to the question respecting what lies beyond the explicit contents of the symbols, a few suggestions may suffice for our purpose.

First, it must be observed that no doctrine becomes binding upon the conscience of Christians simply because of its being contained in the Lutheran Confession. This has become manifest from considerations presented in a former part of this article. Lutherans have no more right to dictate articles of faith than Christians of any other name. What cannot be proved from Holy Scripture has no authority in the Church of God, and no human decree can give it authority. Lutherans claim that their Confessions contain the pure doctrine derived from God's Word, and by that criterion they are willing to have them tested. We ask no one to accept them on any other ground. In matters of indifference brethren are expected, out of charity, for the sake of peace and order, to submit to resolutions and regulations which do not commend themselves to their judgment as the best under the circumstances; but this has no application to the case in hand. For, in the first place, the doctrine of the Gospel is not a matter of indifference and is not subject to the decisions of man's judgment or the inclinations of man's feeling; and, in the second place, men must first recognize each other as brethren in the faith before an appeal can reasonably be made to their charity for the preservation of peace and harmony in the brotherhood. The very appeal to charity in a question of faith, because it sets aside the supremacy of God's Word and attempts to subject the Master's teaching to the disciple's pleasure, is ungodly. In this domain nothing but the Lord's Word is decisive, and by that all Church Confessions as well as all other human writings must stand or fall. To

this the symbols of the Ev. Lutheran Church can in no sense or manner form an exception. If they speak not according to the Word of God, Christians are not only free, but are bound to reject them.

Secondly, as the Holy Scriptures, being the Word of God, are the only source whence the knowledge of heavenly truth is derived and are the original authority in all matters pertaining to it, and as the Confessions, although they present a summary of that heavenly truth, do not contain, and were not designed to contain, everything taught in the Scriptures, there are many things binding upon the Christian conscience which are not explicitly stated in the Confessions. It would be preposterous to allege that Lutherans, in view of their acceptance of the symbols, are dispensed from the divine obligation of everything not contained in them, and that therefore any truth not so contained which may be found in the Scriptures is indeed binding upon other Christians, but not upon Lutherans. Of such absurdities Lutheran Christians are not guilty. Their own Confession, when it declares that the Holy Scriptures alone are the rule and standard according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged, condemns them. Whatever these Scriptures teach is divinely obligatory, whether the Lutheran or any other Church includes it in its Confession or not, and is of course just as much obligatory upon Lutherans as upon anybody else. A Lutheran is a Christian who reverently sits at the Savior's feet and learns of Him, glad to receive the words of eternal life as He gives them through the Scriptures, and never dreaming that they must have the sanction of the Church's Confession before he may enjoy their instruction and comfort. The truth thus learned is not made more divine by being

embraced in the symbols, nor less by being omitted. In either case he believes it and maintains it simply and solely because the Lord's Word communicates it.

But, thirdly, there is, as has been pointed out, a special obligation voluntarily assumed when the Confession of the Lutheran Church has been accepted by an individual as his own. Such acceptance implies that he has searched the Scriptures and become convinced that the association of Christians known by the name of Lutheran holds and confesses the truth which the Gospel teaches. He thus enters into fellowship with others of the same faith as indicated by the same confession. That confession is the basis of agreement and contains the articles of association. So far as the association is concerned, it does therefore make a difference whether any doctrine alleged to be taught in Holy Scripture, is contained in the Confession or not. Such doctrine is binding upon every Christian if it can be shown to be taught by our Lord, and every Lutheran, in virtue of his confessional acceptance of the Bible as the only rule of faith, has pledged himself to accept it as soon as it is shown that the Bible teaches it. But this must be shown, and that makes the difference. All who have united with the Lutheran Church have declared that what she confesses is the truth contained in Holy Scripture. On this they have agreed. They have not agreed that everything that any teacher in the Church may set forth as the teaching of Scripture shall be regarded as part of their creed, though their Confession says nothing about it. By implication it may be shown to be so, and that in two ways: first, by proof from the Scripture, which all have agreed to accept as decisive authority; secondly, by evincing that it is implied in that body of doctrine which has been explicitly set forth in

the Confession. But it cannot be regarded as the established doctrine of the Church merely because some prominent man alleges it to be so. He must prove it, and if some are slow to perceive the proof, he cannot insist that they must be expelled from the Church as errorists or heretics. They can properly appeal to the fact that the doctrine in question was not among the articles of agreement on which Lutherans originally united and on which he entered the Church, and to the injustice of expelling him from a body with which, as to its original basis, and, so far as he knows, as to the belief of the great mass of its members in regard to the point of difficulty, he has been and still is in hearty accord. What lies beyond the declarations of the Confession must therefore be a matter of examination and discussion among the brethren, and can be a matter of discipline only when it becomes apparent that an individual ceases to recognize the supremacy of Holy Scripture, and claims the right to hold opinions contrary to God's Word because the symbols have not explicitly pronounced them erroneous. When the latter position is taken the first condition of union, namely the acceptance of Holy Scripture as supreme authority, is rejected, and fellowship must cease.

We have ardently wished that those who are what the Lutheran name imports could present a united front against the hosts of error and of sin for the maintenance of truth and righteousness. We have endeavored to contribute something to this end in the present essay, although we are aware that some will find in it only the old exclusiveness. But come, let us reason together. If we ask too much when we regard it as an indispensable condition of such Lutheran union that the Word of God be sincerely accepted as ex-

clusive authority in the Church, and that the old Confession of the Lutheran Church, with which she came into being, and on which her very right to exist in the world depends, should, because it sets forth the pure doctrine of the Gospel, be preserved and maintained, let it be shown wherein we have asked too much. L.

THE TREATMENT OF THE OATH IN THE SERMON, IN CATECHISATION AND IN PRIVATE PASTORAL MINISTRATIONS.

BY A. ALTHAUS.

Translated from the German by A. P.

CONCLUDED.

In like manner must the Law be treated of chiefly, at the present time, in the sermon and in the instruction of the children. I do not mean indeed that we Evangelicals are to become legalists; especially do I not mean that, since true swearing can come only of standing by the principles of the Gospel. But what we are considering is the restoration of the fear of God, and that is sustained mostly by preaching and a knowledge of the Law, if this is apprehended as a gift of the personal and holy God, and spiritually explained as the mirror of sin and of God's curse upon it. That the human will is in all earnestness to submit to the personal will of God; that this will of the Living God is really given in the revealed Law; that man actually has to deal with God and with His honor and glory, so far as the Law is concerned; that the transgression of the Law is really a wrong against God and is so regarded and judged

by Him; that obedience to the Law is also really a service done to the person of God, but that man by the transgression of the Law falls into the hands of the Living God, and enters into an inimical relation to Him, to which He responds with His righteous curse; that this curse of God, as well as His will, is powerful, and will be carried out by Him, even to the destruction of the person resisting Him; in a word, that obedience is the highest duty and true honor, disobedience the most inconceivable, the most terrible wretchedness:—all this has on the whole so far vanished from the present generation, and become so problematical, where it has not entirely become foolishness (for the rationalistic doctrine has known how to place its God so far into the dense nebula of the heaven of heavens, that He does not concern Himself—knows nothing—about the petty affairs of men) that against this deluge of delusion and of blindness all mere human remonstrance can accomplish nothing. Men and the material in all its forms have become the gods. These are feared; their favor is sought. It is enough if one can shine before them, conceal oneself from them, or deceive them. If one is convicted or caught by them, if one falls under their condemnation, that is a real calamity, that is bewailed. The shame and punishment of crime have usurped for themselves the sole power of sitting in judgment on morals, and have overthrown the true judgment seat, the misery and curse of sin. If this is to become otherwise and better, if the hearts and eyes of the people are again to learn to look primarily and alone to God and His will in all they do and omit; if in their judgment sin is to take the place in which at present crime alone is taken into account;—then the preaching and teaching of the Law must occupy a prominent position, and out of it must sin

and its curse be set forth, so that this hammer may again break the rocks of their hearts in pieces. It alone can do it, because in the conscience it has a voice whose witness agrees with its own.

No less prominent a position must the testimony concerning judgment to come and eternal retribution occupy in the teaching and preaching of the present, because this part of Christian doctrine has also thoroughly departed from the consciousness of the generation now living. The correct and impressive persecution of this doctrine is in itself a difficult matter, but for this purpose in our time, double industry, twofold care, and the greatest earnestness are to be applied. I am inclined to say that our every word in regard to this matter must be illuminated by the light of eternity, interwoven with the shudder of the judgment, and supported by the mightiest, most incontrovertible and most convincing arguments, so that it may kindle, reprove, elevate and convict. But apart from this let there be no side of life, no department of exhortation, of warning and of comfort, which does not direct the attention to the hereafter, over which the brightness of these words: they will enter into life eternal, or the terror of the words treating of the eternal suffering of the wicked, is not shed abroad.

We now ask, how, in the midst of this work by which in general the way is prepared, the oath is to be treated, *first*, in the sermon. We answer: Let the oath and swearing generally be referred to, and that repeatedly during the year, in sermons, lectures and expositions of the Bible. Nothing should pass unnoticed in order to bring in this subject. The fact that true swearing is pleasing unto God and glorious should be set forth by means of the explanation of the import of the oath itself as already shown—whoever confesses

me before men, him will I also confess before my heavenly Father—as well as of the nature, essence and curse of perjury as the most terrible sin of which the tongue can be guilty. Everywhere let the cardinal point be rightly emphasized, that the one who swears is dealing with the Living God to whom account must be given even for every idle word. Most expressly and clearly should there be a proper distinction made between sinning and crime, yea let the former be exclusively considered, showing that God cannot by any means permit it to go unpunished. To this end should be used pericopes, freely chosen texts, and hints in casual texts, as well as suitable occasions offered in the congregation. In doing this one should always go to work directly on one's subject, saying nothing mysteriously, nothing figuratively, or that is pointless. Let there be no occasional taunting remarks, no anger and scolding; but let everything be done in the spirit of that pastoral love which warns the flock and seeks the lost, and which makes one feel that it is capable of laying down its life for the sheep.

Secondly: How is the work to be done in the catechetical class? Here the task is comparatively easier. One has to deal with receptive youthful minds; one has time, and the doctrines are presented in connection. Here then is the place to bear witness to the love of the truth and to its confession, as well as to the hallowing of God's name in one's daily walk, to impress it deeply, and most earnestly to insist upon the statements of the truth; here is the place inexorably to resist all lying and the abuse of the divine name, and to instill the deepest horror of such abuse and lying; here is the place prayerfully to be engaged with the children in the hallowing of the name of God; this is the place in connection with catechetical instruction in the

Church to work upon the parents and other listeners impressively, warning and admonishing them to consider all this as concerning them in the highest degree. Luther says: "For this reason I say and admonish, as before, that children should, in due time, be trained up, by admonition and warning, by restraint and chastisement, to avoid falsehood, and especially the use of God's name to confirm it. For if they are allowed to indulge this practice, nothing good will result from it; as it is now evident that the world is worse than it formerly was, and that there is no government, obedience, fidelity, or faith existing, but an audacious, ungovernable race, with whom neither instruction nor punishment avails anything. All which is an exhibition of the displeasure of God, on account of such wilful contempt of this commandment.

"They should, moreover, be urged and induced, on the other hand, to venerate the name of God, and continually to have it in their lips in all that may occur and present itself before their eyes; for this is the true honor of the divine name, to expect all consolation of Him, and to call upon Him for the same, so that the heart (as we have already stated) first gives God His honor, through faith, afterwards the lips, through confession.

"This is a salutary and useful custom, and very effectual against the devil, who is continually around us, and lurking about for an opportunity to bring us into sin and shame, into difficulty and misery, but very reluctantly hears, and cannot long abide if the name of God is mentioned and implored from the heart; and many terrible and calamitous disasters would befall us, if God, through the invocation of His name, did not protect us. I have felt and truly experienced myself, that frequently sudden and

grievous misfortunes have been averted and removed, during such supplication. To conquer the devil, I say, we should continually have this sacred name in our lips, so that he may not be able to injure us as he desires.

"It also conduces to this effect in all casual dangers and distresses, if we cultivate the habit of committing ourselves unto God daily, with soul and body, wife and children, domestics and all that we have. From this custom the recital of benedictions, short prayers, and other morning and evening blessings, has originated and continues to exist. Again, children should be exercised in uttering a prayer when anything terrific or horrible is seen or heard, saying: Lord God protect us!—Help, beloved Lord Jesus. So again, on the other hand, when anything good occurs unexpectedly, no matter how insignificant it is, we should say: God be praised and thanked,—This He has conferred on us,—just as the children were accustomed in former times to fast, and pray to St. Nicholas and other saints." Book of Concord, N. M. Ed. pp. 447 and 448.

Without considering it necessary that every advice here given by Luther be carried out, one still sees that in his view also the true foundation for the keeping of the Second Commandment is to be laid in the motion of the love of the truth, and in leading to a true confession, especially to a prayerful habit, which is a chief part of our task respecting the youth. Especially in our time is this exceedingly necessary. We are not only to instruct our youth in regard to truth, confession and swearing, but also to train them up as lovers of the truth, true confessors of it, and soldiers of the Lord. We are to accustom them to regard all their action, speaking, failing, and stumbling, in relation alone to the omniscient and holy God. We are not to conceal from them

their position in this world and its many temptations, together with the objections of unbelief and of godlessness. We are to set before them, in the plainest and most earnest manner, the reasons why they are to believe. We have to refer them to the fact that they may soon be called upon to take an oath, and especially on this account will we not only have to teach the children in reference to this doctrine, but also to train them to practice it. This, of course, must at first be done by means of the right form given to the instruction. Only on such a foundation can the doctrine concerning the oath be successfully built up. Let this instruction first of all be given acroamatically, let it have nothing of the so-called Socratic method about it. Let it proceed with the greatest earnestness, the greatest thoroughness, coupled with the maturest deliberation and with humble piety, moved by the presence of the Living God. Let the most striking Scripture passages be cited and explained, especially the one found in the Epistle of St. James. Let the children be placed in the position of self-acting confessors, expressing themselves considerately. Let everything be permeated with fervent prayer and holy admonition, and let it in this way make an indelible impression in the souls of the hearers. Let it be expressly emphasized that all true swearing is an inward strengthening of one's confessional standing; that a perjurer may indeed also repent, and that an accursed perjurer may become a child of grace again; but that he wantonly permits the power of Satan to bind him so firmly, that it will be very difficult for him to repent, that, in fact, there is imminent danger of his becoming incurably obdurate. Besides, one should in further following the doctrines of salvation, wherever the opportunity is given, come back expressly to the doctrine concerning the oath, as can be done at the close

of the Law, in connection with the doctrine of the Judgment, the first and fifth petitions of the Lord's Prayer; further in connection with the doctrine concerning new obedience, concerning living after the spirit or after the flesh. Yes, earnest care in this respect should extend far beyond the time of catechisation through the urgent advice to the young always first to seek the counsel of their minister or of some other experienced Christian, in case they are called upon to take an oath. Can such laboring for the promotion of the true hallowing of the oath and for the prevention of its profanation remain unblessed in the hearts of the youth? This seems to me to be impossible.

Thirdly, How is the work to be done in private pastoral ministrations?—Confessedly we are here standing before the most difficult task of our office, difficult at all times, how much more so in our time, when the office, if it seeks to become personal, is scarcely tolerated, and when the administration and defense of it in the fewest instances are regarded as more than the word of man. The circumstances are rather favorable yet, if any one, who is to take an oath, voluntarily seeks pastoral advice, so that his heart in a confiding manner is open in advance to pastoral counsel. It is then comparatively easy to teach the inexperienced, to strengthen the weak, to make firm the wavering, to prevent evils which threaten. The matter becomes more difficult when our office has to seek, in this particular case, an opportunity to exercise pastoral care; it becomes the most difficult when it is forced upon us by a party or by command of the court. What mountains of mistrust, of ill-humor, of partizan wrath, and of deception must then first be scaled, before one can get at the point itself. In the meantime, the difficulty also lies in us, since it is well

known that no two cases are exactly alike, and since caring for souls (Seelsorge) is a gift which few really possess, and for which all manner of things must often be used, consisting of something gained or acquired, in a word, of something manufactured, which in every case must be manufactured anew, and yet is no gift. Be this, however, as it may, whether we are talented or not talented, those with whom, on account of the oath, we have to deal as pastors, at all events have souls and in these a conscience, and upon this we must mostly operate. In order that we may operate we have the Word of God which remains a two-edged sword, even if it is considered insignificant, and this Word alone are we to use in this work. Then, too, finally we have the door of prayer through which the true Master enters our hearts and those of the persons entrusted to our care; and without prayer we have no right to attend to any pastoral work, least of all such a one as concerns the taking of an oath.

Otherwise only general directions can here be given. First of all one should obtain an accurate insight into the case in which the swearing is to be done; one should ascertain, as far as possible, whether those who are to swear also understand the nature and import of an oath and of perjury; one should use the Holy Scriptures only, and by means of repetitions and thorough explanations impress the more striking passages upon the memory and the conscience; one should pray with those entrusted to one's care. If the conviction can be formed that the oath may be taken, one should work to the end that the swearing may be done well and that the taking of the oath be in reality a holy confession. If the conviction cannot be obtained that the swearing will be done correctly, if one is tempted to in-

fer that there will be false swearing done, then one should again set forth the import of the oath and what is to be sworn to; one should emphasize the fact that the swearing is not to be done to the judge, but to the Living God; one should read appropriate passages from the Scriptures, and point to the account which must be given hereafter; one should repeat one's efforts at different times, and may God have mercy and help that the Word may not, as in most instances, be dispensed unto condemnation.

PARADISE FOUND AT LAST.

That is what Dr. William F. Warren, President of Boston University, claims. And he himself has found it, that is to say, the locality where is was. And this locality is—the North Pole. Dr. Warren is well aware that this announcement is too apt to call forth a broad smile on the face of every one who hears it for the first time. The North Pole, and Paradise! Who ever thought of connecting these two? Can any sane person seriously harbor such a thought for any length of time? Dr. W. therefore begins the Preface to the book in which he tries to substantiate his claim with the words: "This book is not the work of a dreamer. Neither has it proceeded from a love of learned paradox. Nor yet is it a cunningly devised fable aimed at peculiar tendencies in current science, philosophy or religion. It is a thoroughly serious and sincere attempt to present what is to the author's mind the true and final solution of one of the greatest and most fascinating of all problems connected with the history of mankind."—Yes, Dr. W. is in earnest about it; and whatever we may think of the validity of the

proof that he offers for his proposition we cannot but say that his book is a very interesting one. At least it has been so to the present writer. The whole title is: Paradise Found. The Cradle of the Human Race at the North Pole. A Study of the Prehistoric World. By William F. Warren, S. T. D., L. L. D., etc. With original illustrations. Fifth Edition. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1885.—XXIV and 505 pages 8vo. Price about $2.50.

Interesting, indeed, it is to human curiosity to find out where the cradle of the human race stood. And we for our part do not think that it is in any way improper or beyond the range of human investigation to try to answer this interesting question, though we do not expect to have it answered definitely and without the possibility of gainsaying or doubt. The earth has been given to man to inhabit and to cultivate it, yea, to subdue it and to have dominion over it, Gen. 1, 28. This clearly presupposes and includes that he is to try to become acquainted with the earth and every part of it. And as he knows from Holy Writ that in the beginning man lived in Paradise, that this is the original home of the human race and every member of it: why should it not be natural and proper for him in his wanderings over the earth and his study of the same also to look around whether he cannot find a locality of which it could be affirmed with reasonable certainty that Paradise must, or at least can, have been there? Or do we think it improper or even wrong for a man to do all he can do, without neglecting other or more pressing and binding duties, to find out his ancestry and the place of their abode? Surely not. Why, then, should it be considered out of place for man to endeavor to find the original home of himself and all his fellow-men, if by doing so he neglect not nearer and holier

obligations? To be sure, the Bible tells us that man on account of his fall was driven out of Paradise, and that God "placed at the east of the garden of Eden the Cherubim, and the flame of a sword which turned every way, to keep the tree of life," Gen. 3, 24. We know also from that Holy Book that the waters of the Flood that God had to send because of the extreme wickedness of almost the whole human race "prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high mountains that were under the whole heaven were covered," Gen. 7, 19; and we can, even aside from geological investigations, gather from this that by this flood, whose "waters prevailed upon the earth an hundred and fifty days" (Gen. 7, 24,) the surface of the earth must have undergone somewhat, if not very much, of a change. But all this does not prove *a priori* that it is impossible to point out a part of our globe of which it could be said with a good deal of assurance and certainty that Paradise or the cradle of mankind may, or even must, have stood there. The exact spot, we feel sure, will never be found, if for no other reason, because of the changes wrought by the Flood. Whether *a posteriori*, that is, after every part of the earth has been explored and looked at with regard to the qualifications required for the site of Paradise, it will not finally have to be admitted that no locality can be shown meeting the requirements in the case, is, of course, an entirely different question.

The interest and curiosity as to the locality of Paradise has not been confined to our own age of inquisitive investigation, invention, discovery, and exploration. Already the fathers and theologians of the early Church had and expressed their speculations about it; and many and curious these speculations were. "Some, following the allegorizing

method of Philo, interpreted the whole narrative in Genesis as a parable setting forth spiritual things. Eden was not a place, but a state of spiritual blessedness. The four rivers were not rivers, but the four cardinal virtues, etc. The majority, however, held to the historic character of the narrative, and to the strictly geographical reality of Eden. To the question of its location, numberless were the answers. Often it was in the far East, beyond all lands inhabited by men. Sometimes it was thought of as perhaps within, or under, the earth, in the regions of the dead. Sometimes it was neither on nor below the earth, but high above it, in the third heaven, or some way associated with the lunar orbit. Again, it would be stated that there are two paradises, a celestial and a terrestrial one,—the one in heaven, the other on earth. Tertullian, conceiving of the torrid zone as the flaming sword, which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life (Gen. 3, 24), placed Eden beyond it, in the southern hemisphere. Now it was at the bottom of the sea; or again it held a position midway between earth and heaven. Anon, it was on the summit of a miraculous mountain, which rose to the height of the moon. Of this mountain only the base was washed, when by the waters of the Deluge all other mountains were covered. It was conceived of as rising in three gigantic stages to its stupendous height. All kinds of marvelous plants and precious metals and gems adorned it, but its supreme adornment was a divine river, which, starting from the throne of God in the highest heavens, descended to the holy garden on the mountain's head, and thence parting into four, after watering and beautifying the whole mountain in its descent, gradually lost more and more of its celestial taste and vivifying virtues, and became the water system of the habitable globe. Sometimes the location of this mountain was de-

scribed as in some distant portion of the earth, 'where the sea, or earth, and the sky meet.'"

"Luther rejected all attempts to locate the primeval garden, declaring that the Deluge had so changed the face of the earth and the course of its original rivers that all search was fruitless." This opinion Luther very forcibly expresses in his Commentary to Genesis, where he comments on ch. 2, v. 8. (Walch's edition I, pp. 157 sqq.) But that he only means to deny that we will ever be able to point out the exact spot, we see from the same Commentary, when further on, in his remarks on ch. 18, v. 7, he claims that the descendants of Ham by getting Arabia Felix as a portion of their abode "gained what was left of Paradise" (pp. 1006 sq.); and even, on ch. 13, v. 10, he does not hesitate to say that the Plain of the Jordan, where Sodom and Gomorrah were situated, was the region where Paradise had been (pp. 1283 sq.); and on ch. 22, v. 1. 2 he remarks that Noriah and Jerusalem in general was the place around which country Paradise was." (pp. 2239 sq.)

"Calvin confidently affirmed that the writer of the Genesis narrative must be understood as locating the garden of Eden near the mouths of the Euphrates."

With regard to the opinions and theories now in vogue Dr. Warren aptly remarks: "At the present time the state of theological teaching respecting Eden is, if possible, a worse Babel than in any preceding age. For a partial illustration of the confusion one has only to turn to the most recent and authoritative biblical, theological, and religious encyclopædias. In McClintock & Strong's, the writer on Eden inclines to locate it in Armenia. In Smith's 'Bible Dictionary' the problem is abandoned as probably insoluble. In the great German encyclopædia of Herzog it is declared

necessary to deny to the story of Eden a strictly historical character; it is 'a bit of mythical geography.' In the supplement, however," (viz. to the first edition) "Pressel makes an elaborate argument of many pages in favor of the location at the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates. Dillmann, in Schenkel's 'Bible-Lexicon,' places it in the Himalayas, north of India. In the chief Roman Catholic cyclopædia, Wetzel & Welte's 'Kirchen-Lexicon,' the writer vacillates between Eastern Asia, taken in a vague and undefined sense, and an equally undefined North. Prof. Brown, of New York, in the new work edited by Dr. Schaff, on the basis of Herzog, enumerates a variety of opinions advocated by others, but refrains from expressing any opinions of his own."—Dr. C. F. Keil, the justly renowned and most Lutheran commentator on the Old Testament in our time, holds that the table-land of Armenia, near Mount Ararat, where the sources of the Euphrates and Tigris as also of the Araxes and Kur, that empty into the Caspian Sea, are to be found not far apart, is the locality of Paradise. Dr. Franz Delitzsch, in his Commentary on Genesis, thinks it incontrovertible that according to Scripture we must look upon the plateau of Armenia as the cradle of mankind, but adopts the expression of another, that "in regard to the other two rivers" (besides Euphrates and Tigris) "we have now no means of determining with certainty, and vague conjecture, in such a case, is useless." His son, the celebrated Assyriologist, Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, contends that the site of Paradise is on the Euphrates, between Bagdad and Babylon. The four rivers according to his view are "the great canal west of the Euphrates, called by the Greeks the Pallacopas, the Shat-en-Nil, and the lower Tigris and Euphrates." Lately, a Frenchman, M. Beauvois, has revived the hypothesis of a few others, namely that Eden is

to be looked for in America; whilst an Englishman, G. Massey, in a bulky work sets about to prove that "if there be an earthly original for the heavenly Eden, it will be found in Equatorial Africa, the land of seething, swarming, multitudinous, and colossal life, where the mother nature grew great with her latest race; the lair in which the lusty breeder brought forth her black barbarian brood, and put forth for them such a warm, welling bosom as cannot be paralleled elsewhere on earth."

"The answers which recent biologists, naturalists and ethnologists have given to this problem are hardly less numerous or less conflicting than are the solutions proposed by theologians. Of these answers Professor Zoeckler, in a late work, enumerates *ten*, each having the support of eminent scientific names. In latitude they range from Greenland to Central Africa, and in longitude from America to Central Asia. Of the whole number, the two which seem to command the widest and weightiest support are, first, the hypothesis that 'Lemuria'—a wholly imaginary, now submerged prehistoric continent under the northern portion of the Indian Ocean—was the 'mother-region' of the race; and, secondly, that it was in the heart of Central Asia."

And now Dr. Warren enters the arena of these conflicting hypotheses leading in a new one that in his confident estimation is destined to conquer them all. His book has been written "to bring forward and seriously to test the proposition *that the cradle of the human race, the Eden of primitive tradition, was situated at the North Pole, in a country submerged at the time of the Deluge.*" This hypothesis is by him "scientifically tested and confirmed" by the testimony of I. scientific geogony, II. astronomical geography, III.

physiographical geology, IV. prehistoric climatology, V. paleontological botany, VI. paleontological zoology, VII. paleontological anthropology and ethnology; as also by that of ethnic tradition, viz. of the Japanese, Chinese, East Aryan or Hindu, Iranian or Old-Persian, Akkadian, Assyrian and Babylonian, Egyptian, Greek. Then are given "further verifications of the hypothesis based upon a study of the peculiarities of a polar Paradise." Furthermore, "the significance of our results" is stated, namely their bearing upon the study of biology and terrestrial physics, on the study of ancient literature, on the problem of the origin and earliest form of religion, and on the philosophy of history and on the theory of the development of civilization. The last 60 pages contain 8 appendices treating of as many points connected with the main question and interesting in themselves, f. e. Homer's abode of the dead.

As is seen even from this necessarily brief summary of the contents of Dr. Warren's book, he gives an almost overwhelming mass of material in support of his hypothesis. And we cannot but admire the range, the breadth and the depth of his knowledge, study and investigation. In German and in French just as well as in English he seems to have almost ransacked the literature in any way bearing upon his theme. We must confess to having read his book not only with interest, but also with profit in more than one respect. And pleasing above all is the truly Christian spirit that pervades the whole book from beginning to end. But the main question, of course, is, Has Dr. Warren really proved his hypothesis? Or has he only added a new one to the already perplexing multitude?

We are sorry to say that in our honest opinion the latter, and not the former, question must be answered in the

affirmative; and we are sure that our judgment is at least that of an unbiased and impartial seeker after truth. To be sure, in one respect we are biased and partial and prejudiced, or whatever you may please to call it; and that is this, we hold that wherever the Holy Scriptures claim to give history and historical facts, their words must be taken just as they read; and we cannot welcome any theory or hypothesis, however pleasing and captivating in other regards, that militates in any way, directly or indirectly, against this hermeneutical rule. Dr. Warren offers in proof of his hppothesis a good many points that the present writer has neither the means nor the ability of examining or verifying. In fact, as far as we can judge, all the testimony he adduces seems to tend in the direction of his theory; and we would not hesitate to regard it as the most probable, if there were not several points connected with it that we cannot reconcile with the statements of the Bible.

In the first place Dr. Warren's whole theory is based on the hypothesis that our earth was at first a hot globe, so hot that neither men, nor animals, nor plants could exist upon it; that gradually it cooled and became habitable, and this first at the Poles. His own words are as follows: "That the earth is a slowly cooling body is a doctrine now all but universally accepted. In saying this we say nothing for or against the so-called nebular hypothesis of the origin of the world, for both friends and foes of this unproven hypothesis believe in what is termed the secular cooling or refrigeration of the earth. All authorities in this field hold and teach that the time was when the slowly solidifying planet was too hot to support any form of life, and that only at some particular time in the cooling process was there a temperature reached which was adapted to the necessities

of living things. On what portion of the earth's surface, now, would this temperature first be reached? Or would it everywhere be reached at the same time? These are most interesting questions, and the writer has often marveled that in scientific treatises on the cooling globe he could nowhere find them formally discussed. Granting, however, a uniform interior heat and a uniform loss of it in the mode of superficial radiation in all directions into space, it is certain if these were the only factors in the problem the cooling process would affect every part of the surface in a uniform manner, and we might confidently infer that the temperature compatible with organic life was reached at the same time at all points of the earth's surface. But the factors named are not the only ones of the problem. In those far-off geological ages the heat received from the great central furnace of our system, the sun, cannot have been less than at the present time. Some astronomers and geologists claim that it was greater. In any case, therefore, as early as the time when the earth's atmosphere became penetrable by the rays of the sun, local differences of temperature must have been produced at the base of the atmosphere, whether the body of the globe was as yet crusted over or not. Then as now, viewed apart from air and water currents, every particular spot on the surface of the globe must have had a temperature determined, first by the fixed and uniform inherent heat of the earth-mass, and secondly by the varying quantity of heat received from the sun. But the difference between the solar heat received at a point under the equator and that received at the pole cannot have been less in those ages than at the present time; and this incessant increment of the equatorial heat of the earth by the direct rays of the sun suggests at once the portions of the globe which first became cool enough to sustain

organic life. Then as now the polar regions must have been cooler than the equatorial, and hence, as far as the teachings of theoretical geogony can be trusted, the conclusion is inevitable that there, to wit, in the polar region, life first became possible.—The bearing of this result upon our central thesis is at once obvious. We asked the geologist this question: 'Is the hypothesis of a primeval polar Eden admissible?' Looking at the slowly cooling earth alone, he replies, 'Eden conditions have probably at one time or another been found everywhere upon the surface of the earth. Paradise may have been anywhere.' Looking at the cosmic environment, however, he adds, 'But while Paradise may have been anywhere, the *first* portions of the earth's surface sufficiently cool to present the conditions of Eden life were assuredly at the Poles.'" (P. 57–59.)

So this is the "central thesis" of Dr. Warren's theory, that thesis with which his whole theory either stands or falls. As he states it, and we doubt not that he is accurate and right, modern geologists almost without an exception admit that this "central thesis" is all right, because it is their own invention. But is it therefore anything else but a hypothesis? Has anybody as yet proved that only on the basis of this hypothesis the present condition of our globe can be explained, and that therefore it must be regarded as real and incontrovertible truth? And what does the Bible say to it? That it does not furnish any proofs for it, even Dr. Warren tacitly admits by not as much as making an attempt to draw a proof from it. But we must go further and say that we cannot reconcile the statements of the Bible, especially its account of Creation, with Dr. Warren's hypothesis. We do not intend to show this here at length. We will only ask the candid reader to get his Bible, to read at-

tentively and devoutly the first two chapters of it, and then answer the question, Does this inspired and therefore trustworthy and reliable account of the creation and the development of our globe up to the time when the first man was put on it, does it presuppose, suggest or even allow such a development as Dr. Warren's "central thesis" postulates? We are sure the answer of all our readers will be an emphatical No. Well then, as long as it is not proved beyond the possibility of the least doubt that Dr. Warren's "central thesis" cannot but be correct, that what it says, is no more a mere hypothesis, but must be accepted by every rational and reasonable man as uncontrovertible truth: so long we will also hold to that interpretation of the Biblical account of the creation and the development of the earth that its sentences and words bear on their very face and necessarily suggest to every unprejudiced reader.

In the second place Dr. Warren maintains that the peculiar condition of the polar regions with regard to change of day and night, or light and darkness, is strongly in favor of the theory that Paradise must have been there. That condition he describes, by citing the words of another, in the following way: "Under the Poles, where the darkness of night would continue six months without intermission if there were no refraction, total darkness does not prevail one half of this period. When the sun sets at the North Pole, about the 23d of September, the inhabitants (if any) enjoy a perpetual aurora till he has descended 18 degrees below the horizon. In his course through the ecliptic, the sun is two months before he can reach this point, during which time there is a perpetual twilight. In two months more he arrives again at the same point, namely, 18 degrees below the horizon, when a new twilight commences, which

is continually increasing in brilliancy for other two months, at the end of which the body of this luminary is seen rising in all its glory. So that in this region the light of day is enjoyed in a greater or less degree for ten months, without interruption, by the effects of atmospheric refraction; and during the two months when the influence of the solar light is entirely withdrawn, the moon is shining above the horizon for two half months without intermission; and thus it happens that no more than two separate fortnights are passed in total darkness, and this darkness is alleviated by the light of the stars and the frequent coruscations of the Aurora Borealis. Hence it appears that there are no portions of our Globe which enjoy throughout the year so large a portion of the solar light as these northern regions." (pp. 61 sq.) All which, if it really be so, is, certainly, very grand and nice. And we can understand that a man with any poetical leanings, especially if he be an adherent of Dr. Warren's hypothesis, can get very enthusiastic about it, as the latter really does. But, nevertheless, we cannot subscribe to the conclusion he draws, namely: "Whoever seeks as a probable location for Paradise the heavenliest spot on earth with respect to light and darkness, and with respect to celestial scenery, must be content to seek it at the Arctic Pole. Here is the true City of the Ina. Here is the one and only spot on earth respecting which it would seem as if the Creator had said, as of His own heavenly residence, 'There shall be no night there.'" And our simple reason is that primeval Paradise, the first abode of Adam and Eve, is not at all described in our Bible as being a place where there was no night alternating with day in the same way as is the case with us. The very reverse is true. Must not a man who comes to the Bible free from bias and reads its first and

second chapters in connection inevitably come to the conclusion that the regular change between day and night whereof chapter one speaks did also take place in Paradise? And what should the "cool of the day," Gen. 3, 8, mean if not the time of evening? And when could this have been according to Dr. Warren's North Pole theory?

In the third place Dr. Warren's opinion regarding the rivers mentioned Gen. 2, 10–14 as flowing in Eden cannot, in our estimation, be made to agree with the account of the Bible. He says: "In our interpretation the original river is from the sky; the division takes place on the hights at the Pole, and the four resulting rivers are the chief streams of the circumpolar continent as they descend in different directions to the surrounding sea" (pp. 250 sq.) And if you ask him how he regards the historical names mentioned Gen. 3 in connection with these rivers, he makes his own the "firm belief of various learned writers" expressed in those words: "All peoples coming into a new country love to name their new rivers and towns after the loved and sacred ones they have left in the elder home. The Thames of New England perpetuates the memory of the Thames of Old England. 'It is very seldom indeed,' says a late writer, 'that a river has no namesakes. Very possibly, the Phrat" (Euphrates) "of Mesopotamia may have been named for some elder river of the antediluvian world." (p. 29.) This does not satisfy us at all, and we shall not believe it unless we must, compelled by irrefutable arguments.

And thus, we are sorry to say, we cannot conclude as we have begun. "Paradise found at last" must be changed to "Paradise not found yet." ST.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. VI.—No. III.

JUNE, 1886.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1886.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VI. JUNE, 1886. No. 3.

THE GIFT OF TONGUES.

In No. 4 of the XI. Volume of "*Unter dem Kreuze*,' edited by Past. L. Grote, of Basle, we read in an account by a witness "whose philological attainments enabled him to judge intelligently also concerning the linguistic character of the speaking with tongues" of the mysterious phenomena of the gift of tongues alleged to have descended upon the so-called Irvingians of Scotland. The facts as reported by our source are taken from the "*Morning Watch*," Vol. II, p. 859. A few extracts will suffice to present the salient features of the occurrence and also the claims advanced, that this sect is possessed of the original miraculous gift of tongues, of which we find mention made in the first epistle to the Corinthians, chapters 12 and 14. The "eye-witness" writes: "We observed the speaking with tongues especially in nine persons. We found that in different persons the character of the tongues could clearly be distinguished; moreover, that the same individual occasionally spoke in different tongues. Thus in the case of the elder MacDonald, we could after a time easily determine whether he was speaking in one or the other tongue. At one time he spoke with such energy and expression, that I was enabled to make various observations in regard to his words. The language in which he spoke was full and harmonious. It

contained many words reminding one of Latin and Greek roots, and possessing an inflection similar to the Greek. Several times I noticed, that he used the same root with varying inflections, but never two words occurred in succession, which as to root and inflectional terminations could be ascribed to any language of which I had knowledge." After some cursory remarks on the laws of language he continues: "The sounds which we heard from these persons speaking in tongues were, the longer we listened, the more we were convinced, clearly in syntactical connection with one another, many words had inflectional endings and a resultant cadence, the whole speech was well formed and uttered in characteristic harmony with the changing religious mood—in short, a *real language.*" Dwelling upon the excellent character of these people, their humility and simplicity and freedom from all fanaticism and false enthusiasm, our authority concludes: "Finally these effects of the Spirit became apparent not only in the beginning of the Irvingian movement, but they continue to this day, both in men and in women, and the Irvingians can indeed "boast," that among them *the true (apostolic) gifts of the Spirit,* and especially the most precious of these, the gift of prophecy, have again found an abiding place. Whoever denies this must assume, that all those miraculous phenomena, of which we have spoken, are not of God, but of the devil."

One even slightly acquainted with the theological literature of the last century the fact cannot have escaped, that the attempts to solve the alleged difficulties in the scriptural accounts of the gift of tongues have culminated in a great variety of theories and vague speculation, which, as a rule, must be characterized either as proof of the desire to

eliminate the element of the miraculous and to overturn the fundamental principles of scriptural truth; or as the abortive fruits of a rationalistic and shiftless exegesis, the latter resulting either in contradictions to well established historical facts or in enthusiastic and fanciful notions. Without regarding in this paper the "solution of the problem" by changing the character of the miracle in such a manner, that it is made to lie in the hearers rather than in the disciples speaking, whose words, although uttered in their native language, were heard by the strangers in their own tongue; or discussing the probability of a theory, as advanced by Hermann Cremer, *Biblisch-Theol. Wœrterbuch*, 1872: "Speaking in a form of language wrought by the Holy Spirit, which reduces the various languages of mankind to one collective expression;" "The comprehension of various, respectively of all human languages" pp. 163 and 164; and discarding at once the "critical" efforts of men like Bleck and Herder, whose results can be summed up as negating any and all miraculous effects and impugning the veracity of Luke as a narrator, we propose to examine the texts of the Scriptures where the gift of tongues is mentioned, and, as occasion offers, review the widely accepted theories of such noted men as Neander, Olshausen and Conybeare.

In order to determine the scriptural meaning of *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, to speak with tongues, we must start out from a passage where the subject is treated ex professo. This, we are convinced, is the narration recorded in the second chapter of the Acts, v. 1–13. Neander (*Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christl. Kirche etc.*), unable to overcome the convincing arguments of this passage cuts the Gordian knot in the following words: "We shall be led to different re-

sults as we start out from the description of the phenomenon in the Corinthian congregation, which we find in the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, or from the narrative of the Pentecostal miracle in the Acts. An unbiased examination, as shall be developed more fully later, can leave no doubt, that in connection with the miraculous phenomenon in the Corinthian Church we are not to assume a speaking in foreign languages, but a speaking in a higher degree of inspiration, an ecstatic speech. The narrative of the Acts, however, upon superficial examination necessarily would lead to the conception of foreign languages, and some passages cannot without violence be interpreted otherwise, than that the writer of that narrative had such foreigh languages in mind. . . . . But in all probability we have here not a report from the first source, and we shall find means to distinguish the original nature of the occurrence from the modification of the narrative as compiled at a later date."

Neander considers 1 Cor. 14 the *locus classicus*, the original document, which treats of the data as such without being distorted by the garbled compilation of some unauthorized person. But it is somewhat astonishing, that the fact should have escaped this erudite scholar, that the passage 1 Cor. 14 does not, either directly or impliedly speak of the character and nature of this charism, but simply sets forth its relation to other charisms, its functions in the congregation, its proper use and danger of abuse. And if recourse be had to 1 Cor. 12, 10, the γένη γλωσσῶν, different kinds of tongues, would prove as obstinate as Acts 2. Olshausen is constrained to acknowledge this in commenting upon 1 Cor. 14, 1. "Indeed we must confess, as we have already pointed out Acts 2, that in this passage there is no

cause whatever to conceive the γλώσαις λαλεῖν as a speaking in foreign languages; to this view we are forced only by the narrative of the Pentecostal miracle. That however demands this view so unmistakably, that unless we would assume two kinds of gifts of tongues, against which assumption everything points .... we are constrained necessarily to accept the use of foreign languages, at least at times, in connection with the idea of the charism." (*Biblischer Kommentar*, III, p. 711.) A further exposition of the passage Acts 2 will justify this conclusion.

After mentioning attendant miraculous phenomena, "a sound as of a rushing mighty wind" and "cloven tongues like as of fire" appearing unto the disciples, Luke continues by observing that on that day there were at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven. Conceding this expression to be hyperbolical the list of nationalities enumerated in v. 9, 10 and 11 justifies the figure, for it embraces the representative peoples north, south, east and west of Judea even beyond the confines of the great Roman empire. These men, unbiased surely by any preconceived expectations, out of simple curiosity repair to the place, where, as was "noised abroad," such strange things were happening. Arrived there, they are all amazed at this fact, as they themselves express it, that every man heard the apostles, whom they knew to be Galileans, speak in his own language. The very important point must be observed in this connection, that these men heard the apostles speak τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ, v. 7, in his own dialect. This word is applied specifically to the language of one people as distinguished from that of another. Thus Acts 21, 40 Paul addressed the captain in Greek; but when permitted to speak to the people, he spoke τῇ Ἑβραίδι διαλέκτῳ,

in the Hebrew language. Moreover the διάλεκτοι heard are described as ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν, v. 8, wherein we were born, the mother tongue. The assumption that all these men were able to speak and understand the Hellenistic Greek of that period, many perhaps also the Aramaic tongue of Palestine, is well founded; but the last assertion of the strangers dispells all doubt as to the language heard,—not the universal speech of the period, not the local tongue of their temporary dwelling place, least of all a "union language" composed of elements of all human dialects; but the native language of the birth-place of each hearer. The speaking in this language is described by Luke as λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις, v. 4, to speak in other tongues. With changing terms and all possible limitations the Holy Spirit therefore has solved the sense of this phrase and established it to the discomfiture of all vague theorists and all false pretenders to the possession of that divine charism poured out upon the apostles with a definite purpose and for a beneficent end. The γλώσσαι heard on the day of Pentecost were διά λεκτοί, living languages spoken by different nations, and attested by their representatives.

In this conclusion we are in harmony with the explicit utterances of the earliest church (as conceded even by Neander, l. c. p. 16,) with different views perhaps on minor points, and with the belief of the foremost scholars of our own Lutheran Church. Thus Luther writes concerning this wonder: "In the New Testament therefore this is indeed a great benefit and special miracle, that on the day of Pentecost the Holy Ghost through various languages has united the various lands and nations into one body whose head is Christ." (W. I, p. 1042.) Chemnitz: "And for this reason the gift of tongues was imparted to the apostles on

the Day of Pentecost, that they might preach the Gospel to all peoples on earth and administer the holy sacraments in the language which every nation knew and which it could understand." (Ex. Conc. Trid. Par. II, p. 311.) Aeg. Hunnius: "The confusion of languages at one time was the punishment of pride, Gen. 11. But the knowledge of languages is a gift of God, which is imparted either directly, as in the case of the apostles on the day of Pentecost and of the disciples of the early church in baptism, Heb. 10, or indirectly through the medium of teachers as nowadays in the schools." (Op. lat. omn. ad 1 Cor. XII. T. IV. p. 244.)

In refutation of this position Neander urges two passages, Acts 10, 46 and 19, 6, from which he attempts to derive some light for the illumination of the principal passage Acts 2, in the brilliant rays which that narrative assumes "rather a rhetorical than a simple historical character." "In the first passage quoted," he writes, "'To speak with tongues' and 'magnify God' are placed in juxtaposition, and thereby related conceptions are indicated—the speaking with tongues is a peculiar mode of magnifying God. In the second passage προφητεύειν follows the speaking with tongues; and as the former signifies addresses in inspired language, the latter must be understood probably to express something akin to it. Starting from this point we are led to the assumption, that the new Spirit which filled the disciples, of which they became conscious as the common principle animating them, created for them a new language, the new feelings and views were revealed in new words, the new wine demanded new bottles," (l. c. p. 25.) The force of the argument as it stands is not very apparent; we shall have occasion to bring positive proof to the contrary hereafter.

Another view which merits our attention is presented by the Revs. W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson in their celebrated work: The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 1869, 2. chapter XIII of vol. I. Commenting on the spiritual gifts in the lifetime of Paul, they write, p. 429: "Besides the power of working miracles, other supernatural gifts of a less extraordinary character were bestowed upon the early church; the most important were the *gift of tongues* and the *gift of prophecy*. With regard to the former there is much difficulty, from the notices of Scripture, in fully comprehending its nature. But from the passages where it is mentioned we may gather thus much concerning it: *first*, that it was not a *knowledge* of foreign languages as is often supposed; we never read of its being exercised for the conversion of foreign nations, nor (exept on the day of Pentecost alone) for that of individual foreigners; and even on that occasion, the foreigners present were all Jewish proselytes, and most of them understood the Hellenistic dialect. *Secondly*, we learn that this gift was the result of a sudden influx of supernatural inspiration, which came upon the new believer immediately after his baptism, and recurred afterwards at uncertain intervals. *Thirdly*, we find that while under its influence the exercise of the understanding was suspended, while the spirit was rapt into a state of ecstacy by the immediate communication of the Spirit of God. In this ecstatic trance the believer was constrained by an irresistible power to pour forth his feelings of thanksgiving and rapture in words; yet the words which issued from his mouth were not his own; he was even (usually) ignorant of their meaning; they were the words of some foreign language and not intelligible to the bystanders, unless some of these chanced to be natives of the country, where the

language was spoken." From this extract it would appear, that the author assumes the possibility of a speaking in foreign tongues under the sudden influence of the Holy Spirit, but denies the knowledge by the speaker of the language as well as the sense. Then again the character of the languages themselves as foreign terrestrial languages is called into question by a remark to 1 Cor. 14, 24: "We must not be led, from an apparent analogy, to confound the exercise of the gift of tongues in the primitive Church with modern exhibitions of fanaticism, which bear a superficial resemblance to it. We must remember that such modern pretensions to this gift must of course resemble the manifestation of the original gift in external features, because these very features have become the object of intentional imitation." The position that the tongues spoken by the apostles on the day of Pentecost were languages of foreign nations and were recognized as such by natives from those countries has, we believe, been fully substantiated from the text. To enable us to pass intelligent judgment on all other issues based upon other portions of Scripture, and to gain a basis from which we can examine and decide various other questions in connection with this gift, it remains to be shown, in how far this character of the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν attaches to similar manifestations related by St. Paul in his epistle to the Corinthians.

It is important to observe that the bestowal of the miraculous gift of tongues upon the assembled disciples was the verbal fulfillment of a promise made by the Savior shortly before His departure from earth. The scene is described Mark 16, 15–20. We are aware that the authenticity of verses 9–20 of this chapter has been seriously questioned by "modern scientific criticism," and in consequence

deprived of proof-credibility. Without entering upon a defence of the passage here we would simply remark, that it is so clearly in harmony with Matth. 28, 19. 20, and Luke 24, 49, that we feel disposed to accord it historical value as evidence, the more so, as even Neander concedes the possibility of some "traditional truth underlying the passage" (l. c. p. 25). One of the supernatural gifts promised is described as γλώσσαις λαλήλουσι καιναῖς, they shall speak with new tongues, languages of which they had no knowledge previously and which were not to be acquired in the ordinary way. It was to be a gift bestowed in the same manner as the power to cast out devils, heal the sick, etc. The command to tarry in the city of Jerusalem, until they be indued with this power from on high, Luke 24, 49 points immediately to the events of that Pentecost morning, when the promise was realized in the actual transmission and immediate exercise of the power to speak foreign languages. These two passages where tongues are thus described seem to establish without question the scriptural sense of γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, and the fact that in Corinthians no like attributes appear in the phrase does not make the argument invalid, since the same idea is clearly contained in γένη γλωσσῶν, 1 Cor. 12, 10, diverse kinds of tongues, which the apostle classes as a χάρισμα, a special gift of grace with a specific purpose, together with the χάρισμα of doing miracles, worked "by one and the self-same Spirit" and refers to it again in verse 30 as simply γλωσσαισ λαλουσι (comp. v. 28.) The same result is reached by Olshausen, l. c. II. p. 657, note. Compare also Winer, Grammatik, p. 477.* We are

* Neander, l. c. p. 26, note, quotes a number of passages from the early church-fathers to prove that his couception of an "ecstatic declamation in the highest degree of inspiration" in the vernacular was

therefore forced to admit that the *scriptural* sense of the γλωσσαις λαλεῖν is one and the same as used by Christ, by Luke and by St. Paul, to-wit: To speak in languages which at the time were spoken and understood by various nations of the world, and that this power was miraculously and instantly bestowed upon the Apostles and many of their disciples. In this light we are constrained then to approach the apparent difficulties of chapter 14.

It is probable that at this later period, and in the Corinthian Church especially the gift in question had degenerated from its original purity in such a manner, that instead of being auxiliary to the building up of spiritual life in the congregation, it had assumed the demonstrative form of display, a misuse which must lead to a debasement of the gift itself and a false and unchristian elevation of the speaker above the ἰδιῶται, v. 16, the plain unlearned Christian hearers. This observation no doubt has caused the apostle to set forth the relative importance of the χαρίσματα in the Church and the proper sphere of each. In both lists, 1 Cor. 12, 8–10, and 28–30 Paul relegated this peculiar gift, together with the gift of interpretation, ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν, to the last position, and proceeds in chapter 14 to dwell more extensively on the effects of this charism and its proper use. From the presentation of the matter in this chapter various theories have originated, which have been influential enough to lead many to contradict the facts in the case as set forth above. And even those who, in a measure, admit the use of foreign languages by the apostles, at least

---

the generally accepted view of the first *two* centuries. But we must confess that, in spite of a labored argument with exceedingly subtle distinctions, he quotes against himself and rather makes out a case for the negative side.

"occasionally," reduce the gift to the sudden outburst of an intensified ecstatic condition of the speaker, in which he lost "the guide of self-consciousness" (Olshausen); "the exercise of the understanding was suspended while the spirit was rapt into a state of ecstacy.... The words even were not his own, he was even (usually) ignorant of their meaning" (Conybeare). "But it is not even necessary that the speaker be conscious of the sense." (Hermann Cremer). The first question then to be answered would be: Was the gift of tongues permanent, to be exercised at will by the possessor, or did it recur only at uncertain intervals? We are forced by the following arguments to decide in favor of the former proposition. 1. Our Savior Mark 16, 15 sq. clearly designates as the *purpose* of the bestowal of this gift equally with others, to confirm with signs following the word of those who went forth to preach everywhere. In truth the signs were promised them after the command to go into all the world and preach the Gospel; and Luke 24, 49 the disciples are enjoined to tarry in Jerusalem "until they be indued with power from on high." Among the gifts enumerated together with the gift of tongues, 1 Cor. 12, 8 sq. are the gift of prophecy "which in the New Testament appears as that gift of the Spirit, by means of which faith is worked in the hearts of the unbeliever" (Olsh.). "The charism which enabled its possessor to utter, with the authority of inspiration, divine strains of warning, exhortation, encouragement or rebuke; and to teach and enforce the truths of Christianity with supernatural energy and effect" (Conyb.). Again the gift of discerning spirits, διακρίσεις πνευμάτων and others. The permanence of such gifts cannot be questioned in view of their expressed object, to found and build up the Church of Christ. The gift of

tongues was to subserve the same end. It is therefore but logical to conclude that it also was a permanent gift under the control of the inspired person. 2. The apostle 1 Cor. 14 deprecates the unlimited and unwise use of this gift in the Church. From this it is apparent that its control must attach to the possessor of the gift. He indeed praises the Corinthians as *Ζηλωταὶ πνευμάτων*, zealous of spiritual gifts; (Olshausen correctly interprets *πνεύματα* by metonymy to signify gifts of the Spirit, l. c. III, 718); but cautions them to seek to excel in *edifying* the Church, that is, to practice the less brilliant and demonstrative gifts of interpretation and prophecy in preference, since by these gifts they will edify the Church, v. 4. And in v. 39 he exhorts them not to *forbid* to speak with tongues, although they should covet, *Ζηλοῦτε*, to prophesy. The fact that certain persons in the Corinthian congregation are urged to make a less zealous use of one gift, and that others are cautioned not to forbid the exercise of the gift proves conclusively, that it rested in the personal volition of the possessor to use the charism or to abstain from its use. The words of Paul would be flat irony, if, in the language of Conybeare, "in this ecstatic trance the believer was constrained by an irresistible power to pour forth his feelings of thanksgiving and rapture in words; yet the words which issued from his mouth were not his own" etc. In quoting v. 32 to substantiate this invention Conybeare commits a most astonishing exegetical blunder. The *πνεύματα προφητῶν* etc. he interprets "his spirit was not subject to his will" (Conf. also Olshausen l. c. III, p. 714). The context, however, clearly shows the verse to mean, that the utterances of one prophet were and should be subject to the judgment, *διακρισις*, and approval of the others, v. 29. "Let the prophets speak two or three, *and let*

the other judge." 3. If the exercise of this gift in every instance was the immediate result of a special and direct influx of the Spirit, beyond the control of the speaker, it is simply impossible that it could have been abused to the *confusion* of the Church. This would postulate the implication, that the Holy spirit built up and destroyed at the same time.

As a direct consequence of the fact, that the gift of tongues was permanently vested in the possessor and its exercise subject to his individual will, we must maintain, that the λαλῶν γλωσσαις had a full knowledge and understanding of his utterances. In this we are forced to take issue with all our authorities quoted. They all agree that the πνέυμα in the speaker was acting without the co-operation of the νοῦς, that consciousness was (more or less) suspended, Cremer taking the view that the basis of this phenomenon "was the gift of a language wrought by the Spirit, subservient and suitable to the communion with God ..... independent of the formation of ideas going on in the νοῦς and determining the expression in language" (l. c. p. 163). The theory is founded on v. 14, "For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful." According to Cremer, l. c. subvoce, νοῦς is in this passage the "reflecting consciousness, distinguished from the impulse of the Spirit independent of consciousness" (das reflectirende Bewußtſein, unterſchieden von dem für das Bewußtſein unvermittelten Geiſtestriebe). This definition of νοῦς in the abstract must be conceded as primary; but this is not the point in question. What does the word signify in the connection, in which St. Paul introduces it? In the preceding verses the apostle discourses upon the practical uselessness of speaking in languages which the hearers cannot under-

stand. The proposition is clearly stated in v. 2, where ἀκούει doubtlessly signifies to understand, to catch the sense of the words. The conclusion of his argument in v. 11 is: "Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." In v. 12 he exhorts them to be zealous of gifts which may serve to edify the Church and in v. 13 instructs those who may have the gift of tongues to pray for the gift of interpretation. At no point the apostle so much as hints at the inability of the speaker to understand *himself;* with not a word does he imply that the speaking is an irresistible impulse, the cause of which is beyond his control and the effect of which is beyond his conception and understanding. He rather expressly confirms the reverse in v. 4 Ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ ἑαυτὸν οἰκοδομεῖ, he that speaketh in a tongue *edifieth himself*, builds himself up in spiritual knowledge and wisdom and faith, instructs and bettereth himself. The same word is used of the Church in the same verse, also v. 12 and frequently. How could such a growth, we ask, and increase in spiritual graces result, if the speaker's words were a sealed book unto himself, if he lacked the understanding of his prayers and praises, if he was but the sounding gong upon which the blows of the Spirit fell irresistibly? The truth is rather this as expressed v. 17, "For thou (who speakest in tongues) givest thanks well, καλῶς, but the *other* is not edified." To the instruction of verse 13 then St. Paul adds the cause, v. 14: "For, γάρ, if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful." In the line of argument as pursued above by the apostle, to introduce the νοῦς ἄκαρπος as "suspended consciousness" of the *speaker*, and assign this as a cause why the *Church* can-

not be edified thereby, would be a *testimonium pauperiatis* to the apostle's logic, which he certainly does not merit. The thought of St. Paul is evidently this: For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit indeed prayeth, and I have all the benefits of such communion with God, v. 2, but the sense and import of my prayer is fruitless to elevate the hearts of the hearers and lift them up to the same blessed communion with God, because they do not understand my words and meaning (comp. v. 2, λαλεῖ μυστήρια) "how can he say Amen?" v. 16. I indeed give thanks well, but the other is not edified, v. 17. This interpretation of νοῦς is in perfect accord with the meaning of the word in profane Greek (see Passow, lexicon subvoce) and with scriptural usage (comp. 1 Cor. 1, 10, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοὶ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ. 2 Thess. 2, 2). The eminent exegete Sebastian Schmidt paraphrases: "After what has been said, for example, if I pray in the church in a foreign language, my spirit indeed, which understands the words, prays; but the sense (mens) or meaning (sensus) of my words fails to produce fruits in the believers, since they do not perceive it" (ad. 1 Cor. 14, 14). Aeg. Hunnius: "νοῦς in this passage denotes the sense and understanding of the spoken words" (l. c. p. 255). The same sense is clearly applicable in verses 15 and 19. Finally the phrase νοῦς ἄκαρπος would, to say the least, be exceedingly odd to express the alleged sense, and unique in N. T. Greek.

We are pointed to another difficulty lurking in the διερμηνεύειν, v. 5. The question is asked: If the speaker with tongues understand the meaning of his words, why was there need of an interpreter? He himself would have been able to translate and interpret his ecstatic utterances. We should not forget that the apostle speaks of χαρίσματα, gifts of extraordinary power and designed for extraordinary

effects. The speaker might well understand his long discourses, prayers and praises in the foreign tongue, without having the requisite ability to translate them in course and interpret their full meaning with that divine power which attached to the ἑρμηνείς γλωσσῶν. Hence the apostle's exhortation to pray for this gift also v. 13 is perfectly justified. The verb ἑρμηνεύειν signifies both to translate verbally, John 1, 43, where Κηφᾶς is translated *Πέτρος* from the Chald. *Kephah,* and to interpret by explanation of the sense and true meaning. (The compound διερμηνεύειν, Luke 24, 27.) This gift should supplement the speaking with tongues where the object was to edify the Church, to bring the Gospel of salvation home to the hearts. "Tongues alone are a sign to them that believe not," v. 22, to rouse them from their apathy, to startle and awaken them, to set forth the wonderful power of the Spirit and to incite them to seek after that God, who could mark such miracles. This was the proper use of the gift, which it shared with the gifts of healing and of working miracles. The proper sphere of prophesying on the other hand was to instruct, to enlighten, to draw to the Savior, to convert, to comfort and to bless. The very contrast of the sphere of application of both gifts refutes the superficial argument of Neander, that, since they are mentioned together, they must be of a similar nature.

In conclusion one objection remains to be considered; viz., that special mention is nowhere made in Scripture of the use of foreign languages by the apostles in their work of missionating and founding congregations; that this gift was not therefore employed in the work of converting nations or individuals save on the day of Pentecost alone—hence such a knowledge of foreign languages would have

been entirely useless. Granted that this be correct, an argument *e silentio* merits but little consideration in the face of other direct proof. But we are not inclined to accept the claim as a true statement of the case. As already shown above, Luke 16, 20 relates, that the word preached was *confirmed* with signs following, among which signs v. 17 is enumerated the speaking with tongues. Furthermore St. Paul explicitly declares 1 Cor. 14, 22, that tongues are for a sign to them that believe not, where "prophesying serveth not." And of himself he says: "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all," but adds that in the *Church* ἐν ἐκκλησιᾷ, he had rather speak five words with his understanding, that is, that all can understand and be profited by his preaching, than ten thousand words in a tongue, in an unknown language. We must look upon this gift not only to furnish a medium of instruction among foreign nations; but perhaps more immediately as a sign to cause the unbeliever to lend his ear to the words of missionaries who were equipped with such miraculous powers.

With such results from direct scriptural evidence a correct criterion is furnished, with which to approach and to judge all claims of a nature similar to the quoted assertions at the head of this article. On this basis we contend, that the "boasted" gifts of the Irvingians, whatever they may be, are not identical with that wonderful gift bestowed upon the apostles and their disciples in the primitive church: they lack the promise, the object, and the characteristics of the charism γλωσσαις λαλεῖν. We do not shrink from accepting the alternative as offered on the evidence of the "Morning Watch," cognizant of the truth, that Satan does not scorn the appearance of an angel of light when laboring in his interests. 2 Cor. 11, 13. 14, and mindful of the warning

of St. Paul, that though "an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Yet we do not consider ourselves reduced to that ultimation. The "Phenomenon" is not without parallel in the domain of psychical science and may be satisfactorily solved under the lense of the psychologist and physiologist. In no event shall we be prevailed upon by the apparent godliness of all attending circumstances and even on the testimony of a philological expert to desert our scriptural basis in order to follow after the *ignis fatuus* of fanaticism or deceitful mockery.

T. M.

THE GENESIS OF FAITH.

II.

"And Jesus turned Him unto His disciples, and said privately, Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see; for I tell you that prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them." Luke 10, 23–24. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life; (For the Life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that Eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;) That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ. And these things write we

unto you that your joy may be full." 1 John 1, 1–4. Thus do the Scriptures, which have concluded all under sin in order to effect the salvation of men, (Rom. 11, 32; Gal. 3, 22,) testify that there are "things" on earth, which seeing and hearing, the sinner shall be blessed in the deed and be made full of joy. The Gospel—for this is meant by the things to be seen and heard—is therefore in its primary and highest sense not a message in words but a revelation by deeds. It is a revelation by their realization in time and on earth of those eternal and heavenly counsels which the compassionate love of the Trinity had determined on for the uplifting of fallen man to his first estate. That the Son of God was made flesh of our flesh so that we all are in Him as we were in Adam, that he was put under the Law and in our stead fulfilled all righteousness, that by His suffering and death He bear the penalty of our guilt, that by His resurrection and His exaltation to the right hand of the Father it was divinely attested that an eternal redemption is obtained for us, and that now by the gifts and ministry of the Spirit of this grace and truth such salvation is efficaciously offered for our acceptance—these, in the main, are the works and gifts which constitute the Gospel of God. The Gospels of the Evangelists and the words of the Gospel as written by the Prophets and Apostles are, in the Old Testament the promise and, in the New Testament, the record of those works and gifts of God and of His Christ. They tell of the things which infinite Love has done and would do for the sinner; they are the good news, the glad tidings, which as the light of God open our eyes to the understanding of His work, and as the power of God make room in our hearts for God's unspeakable gifts and there unload them to the recipient's joy. And that this gracious

will and work of God be accomplished in us, we need but see and hear as did the disciples: to be blessed and be made full of joy, nothing more is necessary on our part, but also nothing less.

And can the sinner, as we have left him in our last article, be made to do this one thing needful? He is conscious that something must be done to save him from the wrath to come; and he knows from his own experience under the Law, that he himself is not equal to the task. He is anxious for deliverance, though as yet he knows not whence it is to come nor by whom. This unrest and anxiety of heart, however, are, as we have heretofore observed, caused rather by a fear of hell than by a love for heaven. If at all disgusted with sin it is not so much for the offense it gives to God as for the divine anger it enkindles and the misery it entails on himself as the lover and doer of sin. Whatever the Law may have done for him by way of breaking down such hindrances as stood in the way of his salvation, positively the sinner is as much a sinner now as ever he was before. Not in the least is he thus far delivered from any sin: he himself neither sorrows with a godly sorrow on account of anything he is or has done amiss, nor does he know and believe a God with whom there is forgiveness; whence God has not been able to pardon either his sinfulness or any of its evil fruits. But pardon, with all its holy and happy fruits, is ready for him; and a God willing and able to prepare him for its appropriation is waiting to take him in charge. Knowing what the sinner, as he comes from the hands of Moses, lacks, it remains for us to see how his wants are supplied; or, what Christ will do for him through the gracious offices of the Holy Ghost, and how

where henceforward we conceive it to be placed, will demean itself with regard to the sanctifying and saving influences that are now brought to bear on it.

The first thing to be done is that the eyes of his understanding be opened to the God of Grace and the Son of His Love, and to all those things which have been accomplished for man's redemption. When it is affirmed in Scripture that the natural man cannot know the things of the Spirit of God, the meaning of the statement is not only this that man cannot acquire such knowledge for want of information simply, but especially that, even when the information of these things is brought to him, he is wholly unable of himself to discern them. Now that the great mystery of godliness is made manifest on earth by the Son come forth from the bosom of the Father, men see and hear the wonderful things of God; but, unless God Himself open their eyes and ears, seeing they see not and hearing they hear not. The Gospel is preached to them, but they know not the things that are spoken: left to themselves they cannot know what to make of them. The reason of this is a double one, lying partly in the subject and partly in the objects presented to his view; as it is written: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God." 1 Cor. 2, 9–10 et sq. They are things such, as the Scriptures assure us, angels desire to look into; and look as they may, we may be certain that never have they seen them in their entire length and breadth, hight

and depth. But that men cannot look into them to any degree with right understanding is due to the blindness wherewith sin has smitten them. When Christ on one occasion inquires of His disciples: "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" they report to Him all sorts of answers, and not one of them correct; and when from them He receives the true answer by the mouth of Peter, to wit, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," He declares: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father, which is in heaven." Matt. 16, 13 et sq.

But now the individual, whose education unto faith is under observation, has by the Law already arrived at a belief in the one true God; and hence we are led to ask: does not this belief by implication extend to all the objects of the faith? if not, does it not include at least the subjective ability and willingness to know and accept those objects of faith which the Gospel is intended to supply? In other words: is belief in the God of the Law possible without faith in the God of the Gospel? Does the former render the latter inevitable, and if not inevitable then probable at least, in case the preaching of the Law be followed up by the preaching of the Gospel?

That the God who reveals Himself by the Law is the triune God and none other, we know to be an incontrovertible truth; at the same time we must admit that the fact of it is not apparent and knowable from the Law alone. The latter is only a part of God's self-revelation. That the one true God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—that He is a God slow to anger, plenteous in mercy and forgiving of iniquity—that by such grace and to its glory the Son is become incarnate to save sinners: of these and similar good

things not a trace is found in the words of the Law; for in antithesis to the latter the Scriptures declare that grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. John 1, 17.

In regard then to our first question we are led to the conclusion that belief in God as by the Law alone is in its subjective elements not a belief in the Trinity. The Law being an incomplete revelation, the belief it engenders is of necessity an incomplete faith, even in its highest integrity. As to the other question, whether belief by the Law renders faith by the Gospel inevitable, our reason might be inclined to affirm it did not history, as it seems to us, forbid us to do. It is certainly not easily explained how a person can verily believe God in the one revelation and at the same time deny Him in the other. To say that the revelation of grace may not be recognized by such an one as the work and word of God and on that account be rejected by him, is, as it appears to us, a begging of the question. Certainly this latter revelation is, to say the least, not a whit less real, truthful, luminous and powerful than is that of the Law. Nevertheless we are not prepared to explain the rejection of Christ in His own day by the Jews in mass, and the denial of His divine sonship by thousands of theists since that time, by the sweeping assertion that every unitarian is, after all, an infidel at heart. While we know from the Word that whoever has not the Son has not the Father and is sure to perish, yet will we give to all the benefit of the doubt and hold their faith to be real as far as it goes by their own profession of it. We believe however that when in the heart the Law has done thorough work, there is a strong probability that the Gospel will secure to itself an entrance, though it find it no easy task to do so.

If we recall to mind the very imperfect condition of the

sinner's heart in which the Law has left it, and then remember the superlative greatness of the Gospel substance, it is evident that his transition by faith into the state of grace cannot take place without severe trials to his carnal self and unless mighty efforts be put forth by the Worker of Faith. The Gospel is anything but a glad tiding to his heart in so far as this is friendly to sin; and he finds it much more difficult to understand and believe the great and holy things there revealed than anything declared by the Law. The doctrines, for example, of the Trinity and of the incarnation so far pass all understanding that they will sorely perplex his reason and make war upon his pride of intellect. Besides, the Gospel, in a certain sense, is made to rest on the Law, and thus in an indirect way bears down on his lustful heart with a weight greater even than that of the Law itself. It confirms the righteousness of God set forth by the latter and endorses the sentence of condemnation which this has passed on the moral state of all humanity. Throughout the whole of it, man's sin and his utter helplessness to save himself are the precondition of its every work and word. Were there no sin, then were there no Savior from sin; and thus the very fact that a Savior has appeared in the world and on its behalf mightily attests the world's sinfulness.

From these remarks it will be readily seen that among the first things the Gospel is to do for the man brought to it by the Law, will be this, that it enlighten him with respect to the person of Christ and on the elements of the grace and truth made manifest by Him; and then in connection with this work, and incidentally, as it were, yet most effectively to supplement and make perfect the work begun by the Law.

An example from the Scriptures may serve to throw

some light on this part of the process of conversion. John records that Philip finding Nathanael said unto him: "We have found Him of whom Moses in the Law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. And Nathanael said unto him, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip saith unto him, Come and see. Jesus saw Nathanael coming to Him, and saith to him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile! Nathanael saith unto Him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee. Nathanael answered and saith unto Him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel. Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee I saw thee under the fig-tree, believest thou? thou shalt see greater things than these. Verily, verily I say unto you, "Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." Cap. 1, 45–51. (See also Acts 9, 1–18; c. 16, 14. 15, and comp. 2 Cor. 3, 12–16 and Eph. 1, 17 sq.)

In this narrative there are especially two things to interest us as bearing on our question. The one is the disposition of the convert; the other, the way in which the great mystery of the divine sonship is presented for his acceptance. Nathanael is introduced as a sceptic, and as such he inquires of Philip, who tells him that the Christ is come, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? Nevertheless he is willing to see for himself what there is in the report, and in order to this he follows Philip. Moreover, having come to Jesus, he is characterized by the latter as an Israelite indeed and one in whom there is no guile, (comp. Rom. 9, 6; 2, 29); that is, one who is open, upright, favorably disposed toward the truth so that when once He

sees it He will most likely assent to it. In the second place mark the winning and winsome way in which Jesus greets him and how in the very act of greeting He reveals Himself as the Friend of men, the Searcher of hearts, the Seeer of all things, in short as the very One whom, whether it be He, Nathanael has come to find out.

When now we proceed to draw a paralell between this convert to Christ and the one we have under observation, it may be objected that the former is far in advance of the latter; that Nathanael, as one of those who waited for redemption in Israel, already believed in the promised Mes siah. This is even so, and we claim no identity of cases still there is sufficient similarity to warrant the use of the one as an analogy to the other. We know from the history of the Jews that the Messianic hope of many did not lead them over into Messianic faith when the fulness of time had come. And so we find in Nathanael also an opposition to the truth which Philip declared to him; and besides, that he assigns for his disbelief a reason which was neither sound in itself nor scriptural; then too, that his resistance was not overcome except by words spoken in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; even as Jesus testifies, saying, "Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig tree, believest thou?" If now we turn to the subject of our sketch we find that by the labors of the Law on him the cry was wrung from his heart, What can be done that I may be saved? This state of his mind on the one hand precludes the evil disposition not to give assent to but knowingly and willfully to reject anything that may be said to him touching his salvation. On the other hand it includes and even gives expression to the desire to learn such things as bring peace to his soul. In so far then he is a Nathanael; and

this in consequence of having attended the same primary school, the school of Moses. That he is not Nathanael's equal in all things, cannot be expected, the latter having had the advantages of the school of the prophets.

In the next place, was the subjective condition of faith more promising in the case of Nathanael than it is here, the same can hardly be said of the objective. At the end of the interview Jesus declares: Verily, verily I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man." Now compare that which Nathanael at that time knew of the person and life of Christ to that which by the Gospel a man may know of them now, and what scarcity there, what fulness here! Happy they, we might say, who with the eye could behold and with the ear hear the only begotten Son of the Father in the flesh. And yet, how many were made happy in consequence of such bodily sight and hearing of Him? His divinity, no doubt, was written on His brow, gleamed from His eye, breathed in His voice, displayed itself in the works of His hands and in the walk of His feet—but not so that men had to see and acknowledge it. Let us not deceive ourselves with regard to the advantages the people living in the times of Christ had, and which we have not. Christ was then and for them an object of faith and not of sight no less than He is such for us now. And to bring the soul to that faith, what had they after all that we have not? Our eyes and ears, not of the flesh, it is true, but of the spirit can by the Word be made just as real witnesses to all the things evidencing the divine sonship of Jesus, as were Jew and Gentile who lived in His presence. Were they assured of His miraculous conception and sinless birth, so are we. Did the angel of the Lord proclaim His

advent, and the heavenly host sing a song new to men, we of the present may hear the proclamation and learn to sing that song. Did the Savior then speak words that could enlighten the mind and quicken the soul with holy light and happy life, even so does He speak to us now. Did He then gladden the hearts of men with wine from a plant and press not of this earth—did He feed the hungry, calm the winds and the waves, give sight to the blind, limbs to the lame, healing to the sick, comfort to the sorrowing, life to the dead, and audience to angels—did He then fulfill all righteousness and by suffering and death atone for the sins of the world, declare Himself the prince of life, the conqueror of death, the Lord of glory—behold, to all these things are we of to-day by God Himself made witnesses. And do not our hearts too burn within us as He speaks to us of these wonderful things? And are not His words of a sweetness so alluring and of a power so mighty, that they must win every soul hearing them? But they do not always. Neither did Christ then nor does His Gospel now convince all hearers that He is of a truth the Son of God and the Savior of men. To some this godly mystery is too great for belief, while to others its offers are too holy for acceptance. That his reason, created as it was to know God and His ways, should have become so blind—and that his heart, whose very happiness is conditioned on holiness, should have become so corrupt—that man will not know and believe the witness God bears of His Son, that is of all the mysterious and marvelous things in this world the most dreadful and —the most common!

The Gospel, as the Scriptures teach us, is foolishness to the worldly wise, a stumbling block to the self-righteous, and a bane to them of carnal mind. Offence is taken at it:

by the first, on account of its inconceivable greatness; by the second, because it ascribes goodness and glory to no one but to God alone; and by the third, for no other reason than that it is so very holy and works godliness in all who accept it. But in these very things, on account of which the world esteems it weak and worthless, are lodged the power of God and the merits of His grace. And so great is its efficacy that the soul, which is at all sincere in its search for a Savior, and which comes into the light of it, is sure to see the Christ of God. "But if our Gospel be hid"—writes St. Paul, 2 Cor. 4, 3-7—"it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.... For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us."

When now this light of God is made to fall on the heart that is already illuminated by the Law and rendered anxious for peace with God, it is certain also to shine into the heart and to shed abroad there some of its light and heat—yes, we have reason to believe, an abundance of it if the light be allowed to shine in its own purity and with due persistency. To claim this much we are warranted by the penetrating and illuminating power of the Gospel as also by the present condition of the eye which is to receive its light. To the sinner who already believes in God as knowable from the Law, the facts of the Trinity, of the incarnation and of redeeming grace generally are now presented; and this too by God Himself and with all the evidence He has provided

to establish their reality. Made a pupil to such a Master and one who operates with such means, this instruction, it seems to us, cannot fail to accomplish something by way of bringing the sinner nearer to Christ. The things of the Gospel are held up to his view in outlines so well defined and with a coloring so vivid that he cannot do otherwise but see and know them. Of this there is no doubt, unless he willfully close his eyes, stop his thinking and in every way set himself up against the work of the Holy Ghost; as is done by those, for example, who like the Jews stubbornly cling to false hopes, or who like the wicked are willing slaves to the god of this world. But the man in question is neither the one nor the other. Ignorant as he may be in spiritual things, he is ignorant also of such false ways as men have devised, or if he knows them he is not bent on walking them. And this, in a negative direction, is an advantage his case offers to the Gospel. Again, however sinful he may be, yet is he weary of his burden; and whatever his motives are, he desires to be relieved. And in this too opportunities are presented to the Gospel which give promise of better things. There is perhaps no greater obstacle for the Holy Ghost to surmount than that of false doctrine when this has once taken deep root in the minds of men. A remarkable example of this is given us in the lives of the disciples. In common with their race they shared the carnal views of the Messiah's mission; and notwithstanding all that their Master had done to disabuse them of such notions they clung to them, we may say, up to the day of Pentecost. Generally, the work of illumination is exposed to many vicissitudes, is a movement backward and forward, a much retarded process. Notwithstanding their acquaintance with the Old Testament prophecies

and the fact that Christ had repeatedly told them of His sufferings beforehand, when once more He tells them, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished," the twelve "understood none of these things: and this saying was hid from them." Luke 18, 31 sq. There are exceptions, but these are often more apparent than real—they are in most cases the sudden consummation of a work long in preparation but not observed.

From the above consideration, (to wit, that the man weary of his burden, fearful of God's wrath and free from false hopes, offers opportunities to the Gospel promising its success), we would not have it inferred that he offers no resistance to the truth, nor that in such resistance he cannot, under untoward circumstances, become as arbitrary and stiff-necked as is the most infatuated Jew or the most reckless Greek. No, all we wish to say is that in case he oppose himself to the gracious work of the Spirit in no worse way than his present condition of heart would indicate, that then the power of the truth is sure to enlighten him; and that then to his illumination by the Law will be added his illumination by the Gospel. Should however the sinner's heart prove too obdurate for the influence of grace to overcome it, then must it be remanded back, as it were, to the sterner discipline of justice, as also to those experiences of life which make him feel that the way of the transgressor is hard.

Thus far we have said nothing in particular of such influences as the Gospel exerts on the feeling and the will, nor of the counteraction which the flesh meanwhile resorts to in defense of itself. In the struggle of light against darkness, these powers of the soul have by no means re-

mained idle or stood neutral. The spiritually blind man is not only one who cannot see but one who loves darkness more than light, and therefore one who will not see. Beyond all doubt, the resistance thus far offered by him to the good Physician who at last has opened his eyes, derived its main strength from the corrupt passions and the perverse will wherein sin has its seat and stronghold. Man is wicked not from ignorance so much as by disposition and his own free choosing. He may know the good, yet neither love nor do it. From this it is evident that the illuminated heart is not necessarily a heart that believes unto righteousness. It has now attained to a knowledge of the person and work of Christ, and of the grace of God which through Christ bringeth salvation. But that does not say that he himself has laid hold of that salvation or cares to do so. Very much, yes everything that pertains to his peace, now depends on the attitude his heart assumes or rather is led to assume towards the substance of the knowledge acquired and the truth recognized. How will the heart look upon the wonderful doings of infinite Love, and on the offers of its priceless treasures? What will it think of these things, how feel about them, and what will it do with regard to them?

If, to answer these questions, we only look at the objects concerned, then were the problem an easy one to solve. And just as easy were the task, did we take into consideration the disposition of the subject only. From the first point of view we would predict that the good things of God's grace will be accepted; but from the second point of view, that they will be as certainly rejected. But what will take place in view of both, the object and the subject?

By his illumination the sinner has attained to a correct

knowledge of at least the cardinal truths of the Gospel, and he has been taught to look upon them not as so many ideas or mere notions, but as things most substantial and truthful. That is, he now believes, it may be with many doubts, yet he now believes in their reality, whatever the estimate is which he puts on the merits of the things done and on the worth of the things offered. With this his perhaps reluctant assent to the truthfulness of its principal revelations, a place has been secured to

THE GOSPEL IN THE HEART

so that from now on the Word of grace and truth can bring its light and power to bear on the soul both from within and without. There is now at work in the heart the saving influence of God's grace as well as the destructive power of sin; and although this have still the upper hand, we look for victory to the other. To understand the reason of our hope, it will first of all be necessary to survey the present situation.

That the sinner has by the Gospel received a fuller and better knowledge of God than the school of the Law furnishes, has been apparent all along, as also this that new truths have been revealed to him. The question is, first of all, what change of views, if any, has this additional information wrought in him with regard to the things of the Law? Does he still look upon the Law itself as the mere arbitrary expression of a lordly will, and hence upon sin as a transgression rather than as a moral evil, as an abomination in itself, and as the source necessarily of all misery? Does he take pleasure in sin at this time as much as ever he did before? Are his sorrow on account of sin and his desire to be delivered from it even now as sordidly selfish

as they were? If this be so, then has he neither learned the Gospel well nor in the least profited by what he may have learned. Then coals of fire have been heaped upon his head, but he has been insensible to the burning. Then the preaching of the Word of grace has been in vain; yea, then has he turned his hearing of it into a curse to himself. However, as such an one we have not found him; but rather as a real learner of the words of Love and Life. And the reflex influence of his illumination by the Gospel or that by the Law is this that it teaches him to know that God is Love, that He requires man to be holy also for his own sake, that He rules to love men as much as He loves to rule them, that sin is hatred of the most loving and kind God, that the way to peace is by perfect righteousness only, that with God alone is salvation, and that personal holiness is the condition of its enjoyment. In a word: the real godly sorrow, the repentance not to be repented of, is not by the Law alone but by the Gospel which, coming to its assistance, adds light to the understanding and purity to the impulses awakened in the heart.

That God is Love, the soul can nowhere learn better than at the feet of Him who is the Son of His essential Love and of His love to us as well. His pity and tender compassions, His mercy and grace—the sinner's only refuge and hope—are made manifest only by Christ. But what seems to be not so apparent to some is this, that by the giving to the world of His Son and by the sacrifice of Him for its redemption God declares in the most emphatic way how intensely holy He Himself is and how very sinful sin is. Both, that holiness and sin are and what they are we learn from the Law; but the deepest insight into the absolute goodness of the one and absolute badness of the other, is

obtainable from the Gospel—though it be by inference—which leads us to see how the Holy One is made to serve with our sins and is wearied with our iniquities. When in the bitter anguish of His soul the dying Savior cries, "My God, why hast Thou forsaken me," what a lesson of divine holiness and of human sinfulness is thereby given us! That the well beloved Son must be forsaken in order that the sinner can find acceptance, shows the enormity of sin; that God forsakes Him who has taken upon Himself the sin of the whole world, shows how very holy and righteous God is; that Christ is forsaken for sinners and to their justification, therein is manifested His infinite mercy—and in this its last aspect especially is it most precious Gospel truth. That by His advent in the flesh, by His holy life and heavy labor, by His patient suffering and cruel death Christ would have the souls of men made more truly sensible of their sinful condition than otherwise they would be, of that there can be little doubt. And this is a doctrine which is neither new nor forgotten, as some people seem to think. A new and therefore a false doctrine it becomes however when, as modern theology has done, this use of Christ's life and death is declared the proper and principal purpose of His coming into the world, yea, its only object. By such teaching the vicarious and atoning character of His entire work is denied, and the attempt is made to take away from under his feet the very foundation of the one hope given to sinful man. In view then of what has thus far been done for him, we may at this stage of his conversion consider the sinner to stand as a real penitent in the presence of Christ, and the latter no longer a stranger to him. As a penitent by the grace of God he now perceives that the Lord in all His commands is not only just but also

good; and he sorrows, just a little at least, because by his enmity to God's holy will he has grieved his Maker and Benefactor. That so he sorrows we have reason to believe all the more, now that he knows what the Lord God has done for his complete redemption by Christ Jesus. And thus the question recurs: In the face of Christ and Christ's atoning work, what will he do? Drawn by the cords of the Father's love that are now thrown about him, prompted and urged, as he is, by the Spirit of grace, will he cast himself into the open arms of the Savior? Ah, were there not so many things to hold him back and to draw him away, then could there be no doubt about the issue, no, not for a moment. But just at this juncture the poor heart is often tossed about by all sorts of emotions in conflict with these awakened by the Worker of faith; and how under the pressure of powers so nearly equal, and yet so determinately opposed the one to the other, the man himself will decide, God alone can know beforehand. That many who have been brought within the very reach of the Savior, as this man has been, have halted and then turned back again, perhaps never to return, is but too true.

Here the old heart of the sinner is apt to reassert itself with all the desperate energy of one who is about to die. It has no end of ifs and buts to interpose; and never before, it would seem, was it so prolific of evil devices. Not only that it will question again and again whether what the Bible says about this man Jesus be also really true, it besides severely counts the costs of giving itself up to Him. Yes, of giving itself over to Him that He may be all in all and itself be nothing but the unworthy beneficiary of His grace and an unprofitable servant to His will—a contemplation it finds exquisitly painful to its proud self. Neverthe-

less, this humiliation cannot be spared it if it will belong to Christ. (Rom. c. 3; John 15, 5; Luke 17, 10). Then, too, is it covetous of gold and silver, and of other such things; and this unholy fondness or greed must be rooted out, and, there is no help for it, some of its treasures it must surrender, willingly surrender for the good of the kingdom it would enter. (Matt. 19, 16–22.) Besides, it may be desirous of vain glory and love to take honor of men, and that again is an incumbrance which, unless cast off, will bear it down before ever it can reach Christ. (John 5, 44.) Moreover, the flesh lustful of worldly pleasures and given to vanities, is to be crucified; and this death is felt to be most grievous. (Rom. 8, 12. 13.) Or it asks itself what this man will say and what another; how, in case it turn Christian, the one will goad it with the mockery of pity and the other with the malice of laughter. No doubt of it; for does not this man Jesus Himself predict all manner of trials and sufferings to those that follow him, does He not tell them plainly that unless willing to bear his cross they cannot be His disciples? (Luke 14, 26. 27.) And yet, in order to escape worry and trouble, and fear and pain and to secure rest and joy, is it not to this end one would come to Christ and be placed in His keeping? And thus with a thousand things and in a thousand ways the heart is harrassed by the foe within it. What in the mean time is done by the world and the devil from without, of that we will not stop here to think. Following these considerations we are moved to ask, as did the disciples at one time, Who then can be saved?—"But Jesus beheld them, and said unto them, With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible." Matt. 19, 23–26.

With God all things are possible. It is impossible with

man to come to Jesus, even so much as by one step; but with God it is possible, possible to lead him right into the Savior's arms and have him abide there evermore. Sin and Satan have a tremendous power, and this is all and always exerted to prevent the soul's coming to Christ. But our God is by far the stronger; He can do what He will; and what the pleasure of His will is, we know. Does the sinner brought face to face with Jesus hesitate—does he stop and weigh the things to be left behind, count pleasures no longer to be pursued, look forward to burdens he may have to bear? Indulge him in the weakness: it is a state of heart he cannot avoid on his Christward way; and, who knows, a blessing may be brought from it. Placed as he is just now, we may fear for him, but not without hope. We know that the eye of Him who is mighty to save is on him; that in this battle He, who knows both the field and the foe, is in command; that, if evil thoughts and intents arise in the heart, He is there who discerns them and can combat them. If then the sinner does turn, and be it with wistful eye and longing heart, to survey once more the world to the back of him, it is most certain that he will not see its seeming good and glory without a divine reminder that the whole of it lies in wickedness, that all is deceit and vanity, and that it is madly rushing on to swift and sure damnation. Horrified at the doom of the world, and, we may add, offended at its godlessness, his eye is turned forward again and upward. Once more is he now invited to come, and is he prompted to go to Him who is able to save to the uttermost all who by Him come to God. The warm love of God woos him, and it wearies not; the sweet things of the kingdom are spread to tempt him—if he were but to taste, just for once, and see how good, how very good the Lord is!

He does taste! and we know that there is joy in the presence of the angels of God; for in righteousness and peace to the one and with joy and glory to the other, another Christian is plighted to Christ An unequal watch, do you say? But yet, God has joined them together. Is the bride without virtue and without substance? What is that to you, since it is the Bridegroom's pleasure to provide here with the purity and riches of heaven. By the washing of water with the Word He bathes her soul in His own blood and she comes forth without spot or wrinkle or any such thing. That the twain may be one flesh indeed, He gives to her His body to eat and His blood to drink.

The soul now has Christ and holds to Him—and this is faith made complete, whatever it may lack in perfection. It is all God's own work, and in it we witness the triumph of His all-conquering love. Blessed is the man who has this witness in himself. C. H. L. S.

THE NEW THEORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The apostolic warning given by St. Paul in Col. 2, 8 to the early Christians, to beware lest they be spoiled by a false philosophy and vain deceit, would form an excellent text for a discourse on the character and achievements of what is called modern Biblical criticism. There is scarcely any feature of modern theology of which its adherents are prouder than of its pretended work in the critical examination of the Biblical books as such and of their growth into a canon, and yet as far as the actual elucidation and defence of God's Word is concerned this criticism has little or no claim to the gratitude of the church or of Christian science.

Its work and results have been chiefly negative and destructive of the traditional views of the church; and where it has attempted to be constructive, the structure has been, both as to foundation and materials, philosophical or rationalistic ideas that could lead only away from and not to the truth. Of course when we characterize modern Biblical criticism in these terms, we have in mind only that school and that tendency which claims for itself the exclusive right of being considered critical and scientific, and which condemns all apologetic attempts of conservative scholars as the outgrowth of dogmatical prejudice, as at vulgar *oratio pro domo.* The acme of such critical tendencies is seen in reference to the New Testament in the Tuebingen school of Baur, Strauss and their friends; in reference to the Old Testament in the hypothesis of Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Robertson Smith, and their friends. It is not to be denied, that the critical studies of the present and preceding decades have brought forth also some gold and silver, as well as hay, straw and stubble, and that the eventful outcome of these contests between falsehood and truth always has been and, in the providence of God, always will be a vindication of the truth of God's Word, yet it is equally true that the critical schools of our day, which have managed to enroll among their advocates the largest number of learned men, or Biblical scholars technically so called, are neological and destructive, and as long as the fair name of Biblical criticism is in the common acceptation confined almost exclusively to these schools and their results, it must bear the consequence of its evil associations.

In spirit and method the New and the Old Testament critical schools already mentioned are one: they are both the outcome of a false philosophy and are attempts to make

the facts of the Biblical records fit the Procrustian beds of preconceived theories. Baur attempted to make a deep chasm between the Christianity of Christ on the one hand, and that of the New Testament and of the Church on the other, claiming that the latter was a later outgrowth of a development to which the Savior and his teachings were strangers. With the exception of the four leading Pauline letters he claimed that all the New Testament books were not authentic, were written at a much later date than tradition claimed for them, and that they were not correct expressions and exponents of the primitive Gospel of Christ. The most consistent expression of this theory was the famous, or rather infamous Life of Christ, by Strauss, in which the author analyzed Christ and the early Christian documents into myths. The consequence of these wild claims was that Christian scholars as never before studied the very words of the New Testament, collected and investigated all the documents accessible that could throw any light on the apostolic times, the origin of the New Testament books, and the unfolding of the primitive church. To the present day yet the work continues. The "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," the earliest Christian Manual found about a year or so ago, has been put under the critical microscope and its important truths have been drawn out; the Ignation letters, upon whose pretended spurious character the Tuebingen critics had built such high hopes, have been examined again and again, and the leading patriotic scholars of the day, such as Harnack and Zahn in Germany, Bishop Lightfort in England, are now fully agreed as to the genuine character of the smaller Greek recension of the seven letters, and these constitute a most important historical proof of the correctness of the views held from the beginning by the

church on the character of the New Testament books and the doctrines these contain. In short, although the hypotheses of Baur in the heyday of its power made a sad havoc of the faith of many students of God's Word, it can be fairly said that its influence is broken and that the discussions it called forth have ended in the still better entrenchment and defence of Christian truth. *Magna est veritas et prævalebit.*

Driven out of the New Testament rationalistic criticism has attacked the Old. Its aim here is equally ambitious, the object being to show that the views held for centuries by the Church as to the authorship of the Pentateuch and of other Old Testament books, as also of the character of the religion and the religious development in Israel are entirely wrong, and that true criticism demands an entire reconstruction of these views. The fundamental principle of the new wisdom is, that the Old Testament religion is in kind in manner not different from that of the other Eastern nations, and that the growth of this religion shows no evidence of the interference of any higher than a human power. The Jewish religion is but one of the many religions the world has seen, in essence and nature of the same kind as the religion of the Indians, the Persians, the Babylonians; and secondly, the records of this religion, or the Old Testament books, together with the history of the development of this religion therein contained, are of the same kind and to be put on the same level with other sacred books and other religious growths. The scheme is thus manifestly a purely naturalistic one, the attempt being made to show that in Israel's religion also the principle of development was the solely active factor, just as it was in the growth of the Gentile religions, and that thus this

unique Old Testament religion fits perfectly well with the scheme of comparative religious science—the favorite hobby of religious Darwinianism. The *fons et origo*, the starting point and foundation of this new interpretation of the Old Testament accordingly is the philosophical idea of development. That such are the *Voraussetzungen* of this criticism is honestly acknowledged by the boldest of its advocates, the Dutch professor at Leyden, Dr. Kuenen, in the introduction to his work on the worship of Israel. There it is clearly stated, that all rational discussions of the Old Testament must start out with these premises as accepted axioms, being the "sure" results of the great science of comparative religion; and at the same time it is clearly shown that if the facts of the Old Testament will not agree with this philosophical scheme, it is all the worse for the facts.

The picture of the Old Testament religion that these Evolutionists offer is about the following: Israel was at the outset a people entirely like the surrounding nations, and like them was an idolatrous people, with none of those high conceptions of sin, atonement, grace, sacrifices, etc., which are the properties of Mosaism and prophetic teachings. While Moses was undoubtedly a great man in his day, he was not at all the religious teacher which later generations represented him to be. Here too distance has lent enchantment to the view, and that great legal corpus now represented as having been revealed through him, is really the growth of centuries. In his days the religious ideas of Israel were very crude and primitive. The sacrifices were simply feasts without any idea of atonement being connected with them, and were consequently not even of so ethical a character as was the idea among the Greeks. A

class of religious leaders arose called prophets, who gradually began to unfold and develop these primitive religious views. Soon Monotheism proved to be the outcome of their reflections, although even down to the days of Samuel and David polytheism was allowed in Israel. The priesthood was a later development than prophecy. They first began to show their power about the time of the reign of David, but then yet their functions were considerably subordinate to that of the prophets. It may be remarked in this connection that the newer criticism claims that nothing is known as historically true before the days of David and Solomon, and that the earliest of literary remains of the Jews are even later than this period. The influence of the priests now grew rapidly, and they began to work out a scheme of priestly authorities and offices and of a ceremonial worship. The first efforts were directed toward the centralization of worship, which was necessitated by the erection of Solomon's magnificent temple in Jerusalem. The result of their work was the Book of Deuternomy, which was introduced in the reformation of the king Josiah, and which still admitted all Levites to be priests, and did not restrict this office to the descendants of Aaron. Internally the religion during this period grew only to the stage represented by the legal part of the book of Deuteronomy. Here matters rested until the time of the captivity. During this period the priests managed to secure an almost unbounded control over the people, and the result was that they developed that great scheme of ceremonial worship, sacrificial system, restriction of the priesthood to the Levites, in short all that are considered the highest ideas of the Mosaic religion, and then when Ezra and his pilgrim band returned to Jerusalem, this scheme was put

into actual practice, and, in accordance with it, the worship of Israel was ordained. The law then, is not at the head of Israel's worship, but at the end; the great law giver is not Moses, but are rather Ezra and his assistants; the religion of Israel is not, or at least had not been, *sui generis*, differing in kind and essence from that of the nations surrounding her, but is a natural product, which however took a peculiar course of development; no God is needed or asked for in the production of this growth, natural factors and forces suffice to accomplish it, and it is capable of a perfectly rational explanation from these premises. This is *in nuce* the new Gospel that the "very latest" modern criticism of the Old Testament has to offer. A delicious feast indeed!

But how, it may be asked, do these critics attain to such revolutionary results? Have they access to sources of information on the Old Testament of which the old Church knew nothing? Not at all; they have only the Old Testament books, and where these will not bend to these views, they break them. In the circle of this critical school it is considered virtually as an evidence of insanity to believe that Moses wrote the pentateuch or even any considerable part of it. They go beyond and behind the books as they are written, dissect them, and divide them up into their constituent parts, of which they claim these books are composed. For over one hundred years, in fact since the days of the French Roman Catholic physician Astruc, it has been generally accepted by advanced criticism, that the Pentateuch, or rather the Hexateuch, i. e. the five books of Moses and the book of Joshuah, is the composition of different authors at different dates, the apple of discord among them being only the number of parts and the time of the composition of these parts. The theories on these points

were and are almost numberless. According to the new turn given to the pentateuchal kaleidoscope by Graf, Wellhausen and others, the following picture is presented to the eyes: The oldest portion of the pentateuch is the Jehovist, i. e. that portion which uses the name Jehovah in the book of Genesis and in Exodus down to chap. 6. This Jehovist begins with Gen. 2, 4, contains some portions of the history of the Patriarchs, and has incorporated within its limits a few passages in which the word *Elohim* is used as a name of God, so that the joint composition is represented in critical language as J. E. This Jehovistic portion was written about the time of David. Its most important section is the so-called Book of Covenant, found in Ex. 20–22 and 34, and these chapters, it is claimed represent quite fairly the growth of Israel's religion in the days of David. It will be seen from an examination of these chapters, that they presuppose a primitive state of affairs among an agricultural people, and that none of the higher ethical and religious ideas of Mosaism are contained in them. The fact that these chapters open with the Decalogue does not trouble our critics very much; they simply state that this is a later addition, as in the nature of the case, no such high truths as those contained in the Decalogue could have been given at so early a date. Such a supposition would be contrary to the philosophy of things.

Next in date comes Deuteronomy, representing the stage of religion in the days of King Josiah. This book is considered a forgery; not being an old book re-discovered, but having been put into the temple in order to have it represented as a divine recognition of the recent additions made by the priests to the religion of the people. The historical introductory chapters are by a later hand. The

bridge between the Deuteronomic stage and that represented by the latest and greatest element, the Priest Codex, is the vision of the temple in the closing chapters of Ezekiel, the priest-prophet. It was only after the captivity that this element was added to Israel's religion. The Priest Codex, usually designated as P. C. contains all those portions of Genesis in which the name *Elohim* is used for God, as also the greater portion of Exodus, all of Leviticus and all the legal sections of Numbers, in other words, the whole legal and ceremonial body of the Mosaic books. This was the outgrowth of the exile, and represented the acme of priestly influence and the heighth of ceremonial worship. These elements were afterwards united by a mysterious being called the Redactor, and marked R. who indeed smoothed over some of the discrepancies and contradictions between the different documents, but left enough of them stand to give the modern critic the clue to the true inwardness of the composition of the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch, or rather Hexateuch, as we have it now is composed of the combined labors of the Jehovist and an elder Elohist, the Deutronomist, the author of the Priest Codex, and the Redactor, or, to put it into a favorite mathematical formula, it is the result of P I+D+P C+R. and these cover the period from the time of David to the days of Ezra.

But how harmonize this scheme with the other books of the Bible? Where there is a will there is also a way, no matter how crooked the latter may be. Our critics know how to help themselves. The fact that Christ and His apostles, as also the whole New Testament, stand in direct opposition to such views of the Old Testament religion does not disconcert them; the Savior is merely in their eyes a child of His own time, and as such shared the false views

of His day on the books and religion of the Old Testament. They had not then learned the critical methods of our day and date. Nor do the books of the Old Testament form any better basis for opposing the new views. The strongest argument against the whole idea would seem to be the Books of Chronicles, which describes the whole course of Israel's history from the very standpoint of the priesthood which the new theorists claim to be post-exilian in origin. But, we are told, the author of the Books of Chronicles is a false historian, and has carried his priestly ideas back into a time when such ideas did not exist. Accordingly all testimony from these books must be ruled out, according to the laws of strictly scientific criticism. The same summary process is resorted to in the case of the prophets. It is well known that a number of prophets have references directly and indirectly to those very Levitical ordinances which are claimed to be later than the exile. These are either deprived of their true meaning by a false exegesis, or else the whole book, if the former process is found too bold, is relegated to the period of the exile. This, e. g. is the case with the prophet Joel. So that after the prophetic books have been robbed of all their reference to and connection with the laws of Moses, they are *nolens volens* made to agree with this Darwinian theory of Old Testament history and theology. The psalms suffer in a similar manner; those showing the spirit of the so-called Priest Codex are called post-exilian or Maccabean. The strongest argument these critics have for their notions, is an *argumentum ex silentio*. It must be acknowledged that in Israel's history the Mosaic code did not exert that all-controlling influence which it was intended to exert, and that in the later records of this people there are violations again and again of the commands of this law;

but to conclude from this that such a law did not exist is sheer folly. In the same manner we might prove that Christianity had no Bible before the days of Luther.

It is evident from this brief sketch that both in method and in results the newer criticism of the Old Testament is revolutionary. It is rationalistic to the core, an outgrowth of the tyranny of the idea of development in philosophy; it is based upon an idea that excludes not only all revelation of God in the sacred records of the Old Testament, but also any activity of God in the establishment of this religion and in its growth. It drives God from history and from the Bible, and in His place puts a naturalistic development. It is true, that these wild ideas have been able to gain as advocates quite a number of Old Testament scholars in Germany and Holland, but its days are apparently numbered, and it is now on the defensive. It goes without saying, that no true Christian, who understands his Christianity and understands what this new hypothesis is and what it implies, can entertain it for a moment. It is anti-Scriptural and false. But the outcome of the debate it has called forth will undoubtedly be only a better vindication of God's eternal truth.

G. H. S.

LUTHER ON QUESTIONS OF DIVORCE.

Translated by J. A. S.

The divorce-question arising in various forms is sometimes very perplexing to our pastors and people. It is true, we all accept the Bible as the infallible rule in matters of doctrine and life, yet the application of this rule to special

cases is not always clear and easy. Therefore we discuss the question at synods and conferences and solicit the views of the more experienced in order to attain to a proper understanding. And we do not merely consult men of knowledge and experience, but also the books and writings of our Fathers who were specially gifted and fitted for expounding the Scriptures. And among these fathers and teachers of the Church, Dr. Luther is the most prominent. For this reason it will be well to consult him on the above question. Some of our people have no access to his writings. For their sake we will give some extracts of his in English. These extracts are all taken from the Erlanger Edition.

WHICH PERSONS MAY BE DIVORCED?

I know of three causes for separating husband and wife. The first cause is to be found in the incapacity of husband or wife, on account of physical deformity.

The second reason is adultery. Concerning this point popes have been silent; therefore do we have to hear what Christ says, Matt. 19, 4, etc., where the Jews ask Him whether a man may leave his wife for various reasons. Jesus answers: Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, etc.

Here you observe, that Christ states that husband and wife may separate on account of adultery and that the innocent may marry again. And He calls it adultery if a man leaves his wife and marries another (except in the case of fornication). He shows plainly that a man leaving his wife on account of adultery and marrying another woman, commits no adultery.

The Jews left their wives whenever they chose, for all kinds of reasons, even if no adultery had been committed. They themselves felt this to be a doubtful matter. Hence they ask Christ whether it was right, and expect an answer concerning the law of Moses.

In the laws of Moses, God gave two kinds of governments and commandments. Some were spiritual, and were intended to teach piety before God, such as love and obedience. Those observing these laws, did not put their wives away, they had no use for bills of divorce, but would bear with the evil habits of their wives. Others were civil laws, given for those who would not keep the spiritual laws, in order that these might be somewhat constrained and not be permitted to live in wantonness or to commit worse things. Hence He commanded them if they could not endure their wives, not to kill them or seriously injure them otherwise, but to dismiss them and to give them a writing of divorcement. Such a law is not intented for Christians, who live under a spiritual government. In case some are not living like Christians with their wives, it might be well now to apply such a law to them, i. e. if they are known to be no Christians.

Thus we see that, on account of adultery, one may leave the other, as Solomon also says Prov. 6, 32: "Whoso committeth adultery with a woman lacketh understanding." We have also the example of Joseph, Matt. 1, 19, whom the Evangelist praises for having been just, because, when he found Mary to be with child, he did not make her a public example but intended to put her away secretly. This shows that it is praiseworthy to put away an adulteress; whilst the husband, if the adulteress is unknown, is at liberty to do both; either privately to admonish his wife in a brotherly

manner and to keep her if she promises to do better, or to put her away, as Joseph had intended to do. The same the wife may do under similar circumstances. These two modes of reproof are Christian and praiseworthy.

But to effect a public divorcement and to allow the parties to marry again, must be done with the consent of the civil government and by its authority, and adultery in this case must be known to the public, or else, if civil authorities will not act, it should be done with the knowledge (and consent) of the congregation, in order that persons in the church may not separate at will and for any reason whatever. . . . . If one commits adultery, he has already divorced himself and is to be considered a dead person. For this reason the other party may marry again, just as if his former companion were dead, that is, if he will make use of his right and not exercise pardon.

However if civil authorities do not inflict capital* punishment and husband and wife wish to remain together, punishment should be applied publicly according to the Gospel and in a Christian manner, Matt. 18, 15–17. For there are no more forms of correction among men than these three: The one being brotherly and private; the other, evangelical, applied publicly before the congregation; and the third attended to by civil authority.

The third reason for divorce is to be found in the fact where one withdraws from the other, and refuses to live together, and to perform his conjugal duties. . . . . In this case the words of St. Paul are to be applied 1 Cor. 7, 4. 5.

Besides these three reasons for divorce there is another one, which permits husband and wife to be separated, with

* Luther advocated capital punishment in case of adultery, in conformity with Mosaic Law.

the condition however that both of them remain single, or be reconciled again. This arises in case a husband and his wife disagree, not on account of conjugal duties but other matters. Of this St. Paul speaks 1 Cor. 7, 10. 11. Concerning such wives Solomon complains very much (Prov. 5, 4. 5) when he says: "Her end is bitter as wormwood, sharp as a two-edged sword. Her feet go down to death; her steps take hold on hell." Thus also many filthy, wild and insufferable men are found.

If in such a case the one would be a strong Christian and able to bear the wickedness and evil of the other, his undertaking would be a glorious and blessed cross and agreeable to the way which leads to heaven..... But if he is not able to do it he should get a divorce and remain single all his life, rather than be tempted and induced to do something worse. If, however, he would say it was not his fault, but the fault of the other party, and would on that account marry some one else, he is wrong. Whilst the performance of conjugal duties are not refused, he is bound to endure the evil or to permit God to take the cross from him. The saying is to be applied here: Whoever wishes to have fire must take the smoke in the bargain.

But how in the case in which a husband or a wife is afflicted by a continued disease and unfit for conjugal duties? then might not the other party take another? By no means; but let him take care of the sick and serve God by so doing, as though God had sent a saint into his house that by taking care of him he should earn salvation. Thrice blessed are you if you perceive such gift and grace and serve your husband or wife for God's sake. If however you reply: I have not the gift of abstinence, you are not speaking the truth. If you serve your sick companion in all sin-

cerity, and recognize that God has sent him to you, and thank Him for it, then trust that He will provide and that He certainly will be gracious and not suffer you to bear more than you are able to bear. He is ever so faithful, and will not deprive you of your consort by sickness without subduing the lust of your flesh, whilst you are serving your sick consort faithfully. Vol. 20, p. 69–74.—A. D. 1522.

And unto the married I command, yet not I but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife. 1 Cor. 7, 10. 11. . . . The apostle here permits husband and wife to separate themselves, with the condition to remain single. Thereby he revokes the law of Moses, according to which a man was authorized to put away his wife whenever he became angry at her or got tired of her, and to marry another; his former wife also being permitted to marry another husband (Deut. 24, 1, 2.) This law of Moses gave great authority to the stubborn and heathenish Jews, and is by no means applicable to Christians. Therefore Christ revokes it himself, Matt. 19. In the Old Testament are found not only such laws as were intended for spiritual purposes, but also such as were for civil government, because God Himself was the Governor of the people in both respects. Even as now the imperial authority embraces many things intended for civil government, as for instance, to subdue power by power, which would not become Christians. . . . .

However the Apostle here speaks of a cause for divorce, i. e. of anger or wrath, on account of which husband and wife cannot live together in peace and are prevented from joining in prayer or to perform any good work. This is evident from the text, in which he saith: They shall be

reconciled and not be separated or else, if they are not reconciled and want to be separated, they shall remain single. Whenever reconciliation is demanded, it is presupposed that enmity and dissension exist. · Separation under these circumstances, the apostle certainly admits; because two cannot agree, he winks at the weakness of the Christian; otherwise it is everyone's duty to "bear each other's burden" and not to separate himself. This is the reason also, why he does not allow those who are separated to enter new marriage relations, in order to leave room for coming together again, and thereby be compelled and urged to come to an agreement, because they perhaps do not possess the gift of chastity.

But how, in case one did not want to be reconciled and persisted to remain separated and the other did not possess the gift of chastity and had to have a companion, what should this one do? Would a man be permitted to marry again? Answer: Certainly. Because he is not commanded to live in a state of abstinence or in virginity, neither may he possess that gift, and his wife will not join him but withholds from him her body which he cannot dispense with, therefore God will not require of him anything impossible for the sake of another's obduracy. He must act as though his consort had died, especially as it is not his fault that they do not live together. The party that refuses to be reconciled, however, shall not be permitted to marry again. . . .

But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases. 1 Cor. 7, 15. Here the apostle relieves the Christian and authorizes and empowers him to marry again, i. e. if the infidel party deserts him or will not permit the other party to lead a Christian life.

Whatever is said here by St. Paul of the unbelieving or

heathenish spouse, is to be applied also to a false Christian: If the one will not suffer the other to lead a Christian life, but uses every effort to mislead him into wickedness or leaves him, the Christian shall be free and at liberty to marry another. For if this were wrong then the Christian party would have to run after the un-Christian party or else be in bondage on account of the wickedness of the other and be in danger of losing his soul, because he might not be able nor willing to live in chastity. This St. Paul answers in the negative. He says: In such cases the brother or sister is not under bondage; as though he would say: In other cases, in which married people remain together, in the performance of conjugal duties, etc., they are bound together and not at liberty to marry others. But in case in which one incites the other to live an un-Christian life or deserts him, he is not bound nor compelled to cleave to him. If however he is not bound he is released and free, and if released and free then he is at liberty to marry again, just as if his wife (or her husband) were dead.

But should not the Christian husband or wife wait until the un-Christian party would return or die, as has been the custom in accordance with ecclesiastical law? Answer: If any one will wait, he is at liberty to do so; but because the apostle releases him, he is not compelled to wait but may marry again in God's name. Would to God, this doctrine of St. Paul had been in practice or would be put into practice now—for in case husband and wife separate, the one leaving the other, then have followed much adultery and sin. This has been the result of the miserable law of the pope, who, contrary to the words of the apostle, has urged and compelled a husband or wife, at the risk of their soul's salvation, to wait for the return or death of the desert-.

ing party and not to enter a new marriage; and has thus, in such cases, held in bondage a brother or sister, on account of the wickedness of another, and has driven people into danger and unchastity without a cause.

But in case the party having left should return and promise to do better, should he be received again? Answer: In case the one that has remained is not married again, he may receive the returning one, and it is to be advised that they again should live together; but in case the one has in the meantime entered into another marriage relation, he is by no means to accept the returning one, but let him go. Deut. 24 may be applied here, according to which the husband could not have his former wife again who had been sent away, though she is released from her other husband by death or a bill of divorce. This should be observed in this case, in order that he may be punished for his running away. This rule would undoubtedly also prevent many separations. But as the pope has opened the way for the deserters and favors their wickedness and knavery by permitting them to return, it is no wonder, that the world is full of broken marriages, yea, and full of adultery, which the devil has sought to accomplish by the law (of the pope). Vol. 51, p. 36–45.—A. D. 1523.

TO THE COUNCIL AND PASTOR AT DOMITSCH, AUG. 18. 1525.

Grace and peace in Christ. Honored and dear Sirs: In answer to your writing concerning the marriage of your Pastor I will give my opinion in brief.

Inasmuch as his wife is acting very dishonestly toward him, I can neither contract nor expand his rights, any more than God himself has done, who for such cases has given a decision by St. Paul 1 Cor. 7, 15: If the unbelieving depart,

let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases.

Thus I also add: Whoever will not remain, let him go! The other party is not thereby compelled to remain single, as I have written more fully on that chapter in a book, which you may read. If now he cannot remain without a wife, let him take another one in God's name, because his former wife does not want him. M. Luther. Vol. 53, p. 326.

We have heard that death is the only cause for divorce. God had commanded in the Law of Moses to stone the adulterer, therefore it is certain that adultery divorces, because it condemns to death. For this reason Christ forbids (Matt. 19, 9) the separation of husband and wife, "except it be for fornication; and he who marries another committeth adultery." This saying is observed also by Joseph (Matt. 1, 20) when he intended to put Mary away, because he took her to be an adulteress, whilst he is lauded by the Evangelist as having been pious. He would, however, not have been pious if he had put Mary away without cause and right.

If therefore a husband or wife commits adultery, and such can be proven, I will not and can not prevent the innocent party from separating and marrying another; though it would be much better, if possible, that they be reconciled and continue to live together. If the innocent party however will not agree to it, it may make use of its rights, in God's name, yet in such a way that the separation be effected not arbitrarily by the individual, but in accordance to the judgment and council of the pastor or magistrate; except he would prefer, like Joseph, to leave the country privately. If however he prefers to remain, he could obtain a publicly recognized divorce.

But in order that such separations be discouraged as much as possible, the one party should not be permitted to marry again too soon, but to wait at least a year or a year and a half, otherwise it would have the appearance as though the one was pleased by the adultery of the other, and as though he would gladly embrace the opportunity of getting rid of his consort and ready to marry another, and thus to practice wantonness under the cover of lawful right. Such knavery would show that such an one would leave the adulterer or adulteress so readily, and to anxiously look around for another, not out of hatred against adultery, but out of aversion and hatred against his consort and out of preference and longing for another.

In the next place, and in case civil officers neglect to inflict deserved punishment, pastors should make every effort to induce the guilty party to humble himself and to ask pardon of the innocent. After this has been effected the innocent is to be approached by words of Scripture in which God commands us to forgive. It must then be impressed upon their conscience and they be informed of the sinfulness of not forgiving and receiving the penitent one for the purpose of making amendment. For we all are in danger of falling. And who is without sin? And if we had fallen, how would we wish our neighbor to act toward us? This we should remember and act accordingly. We should be diligent in the exercise of Christian love and duty towards others and forgive them if they promise to do better, and thus to prevent, if possible, the application of the right of obtaining a divorce. If this is in vain, then let right and justice have their way.

Besides this there is another question if husband or wife forsake their cansort. May the forsaken enter new

marriage relations? Answer: If they separate by mutual knowledge and consent, as for example, merchants or soldiers who travel from home; or caused by force or other reasons, it cannot be allowed. In this case the one party should not marry again, but wait until it is certain and established that the other party is dead. . . . . This should be observed by the wife of a merchant who has agreed to a journey and the dangers of the same, especially if it is for the purpose of temporal gain, else she should have kept her husband at home and been content in her poverty.

But how is it in the case of a knave, as I have fonnd many to be, who takes a wife, lives with her for a while and enjoys life as best he can, afterwards he leaves her secretly and, assassin-like without her knowledge or consent, leaves her pregnant or with children, and does not send nor offer her any support but follows his knavery and returns in one, two, three, four, five or six years, and expects to be received again, and to find house and home prepared for his reception? In such case it would be well if the government would make and enforce stringent laws. . . . .

These and other abominations occur because it has not been preached nor received what the state of matrimony is. Nobody has taken it to be a creation or estate commanded of God and committed to the control of civil government. Hence everybody has treated it arbitrarily and as his own affair without being troubled about it in conscience. But not so, my dear fellow: after you are once bound to a woman you are no longer free. God commands and compels you to stay with your wife and children, to provide and educate them and also to be obedient to your government, and to advise and help your neighbors. . . . .

A different case it is, if one leaves the other out of im-

patience or wrath. Here the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 7, 4, are to be applied and a reconciliation be effected or else to remain unmarried afterwards. For such a case may occur, in which it is better to remain separate than to live together. Vol. 23, 143–147. A. D. 1530.

As it regards the actions concerning matters of matrimony and divorcements I have said that they should be left to jurists and civil authorities, because matrimony is altogether a worldly and external matter, and wife, child, house, land and other things are placed under civil authorities and are altogether subject to reason, Gen. 1. Whatever therefore civil authorities and wise men conclude and decide we should submit to. For even Christ does not conclude or decide anything in matters pertaining to this world as a jurist or magistrate, but instructs as a preacher in matters of conscience and shows how to use the law concerning divorce aright and not for the encouragement of knavery and wantonness, contrary to the law of God. For this reason we will not go any further in these matters but merely examine how they have stood and how those who want to be Christians should conduct themselves; in order that we may keep our office unspotted and go no further than we have been commanded to go. Those who are no Christians are not to be governed by the Gospel but by constraint and correction, and hence do not concern us.....

If you ask: Is no reason to be found why husband and wife may be divorced and be married again? We answer: Christ points to but one (Matt. 19) which is adultery and takes it from the law of Moses according to which the adulterer is to be punished with death. As death therefore alone makes matrimony void, the adulterer is divorced already, not by men, but by God Himself, and not merely

from his consort but from life. By adultery he has separated himself from his consort and severed the matrimonial tie, which he was forbidden to do, and has thereby made himself guilty of death, and is dead already before God, though he is not sentenced to be put to death. As in this case God Himself separates, and the other party is free he is not compelled to retain his consort who has proved himself faithless toward him, except he chooses to do so of his own accord.

Divorcements of this kind, however, we do neither commend nor forbid, but recommend them to be treated by civil authorities and that parties submit to whatever they decide in these matters. Yet it would be far better that both parties, especially those who want to be Christians, be advised and admonished to remain together, and that the innocent party be reconciled to the guilty one and to forgive, that is, if the latter begs pardon and promises to do better. But if there is no prospect for amendment, or the guilty having been pardoned and graciously restored would abuse such favor and continue publicly in his lewd course and depend on further indulgence and forgiveness, I would neither advise nor demand that grace be extended, but rather advise and help that such an one be scourged or bagged. One fall might be forgiven, but a continuance in wantonness and sin, depending at the same time on favor and forgiveness, is not to be suffered...

Besides this cause for divorce, namely adultery, we have another one, which arises when one leaves the other out of mere wantonness. In case the wife is a heathen and the husband a Christian, or as we may say, the one cleaves to the Gospel but the other does not (concerning which St. Paul writes, 1 Cor. 7), can they be divorced? St. Paul con-

cludes: If the one will remain the other should submit, though they are not one in faith, for faith or unbelief is no cause for divorce. But in case the one refuses absolutely to remain, the other should let him go, he is not held to run after him. Vol. 43, p. 116–121. A. D. 1532.

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are $2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. C. H. L. Schuette, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. IV.

		PAGE.
1.	LUTHERAN UNION, by Prof. M. Loy	193
2.	THE OFFICE OF FAITH, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette	217
3.	ENVIRONMENT AND CHARACTER, by Rev. E. Pfeiffer	231
4.	WHAT THE ROMAN CATHOLICS WANT, by Prof. A. Pflueger	249

Monies Received for Volume VI.

Rev. C. Spielmann, Rev. H. J. Schuh, Rev. C. E. Herbst, each $4.00, Rev. J. J. Weiss, Rev. G. Dillmann, Rev. A. Birch, Rev. W. L. Busch, each $2.00, Rev. W. Weisman $6.00, Rev. S. P. Long, Rev. M. C. H. Hein, each $1.00, Rev. H. G. Sauer 35 cts., Ad. Trautman, Geo. Krug, each $10.00.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. VI.—No. IV.

AUGUST, 1886.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1886.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VI. AUGUST, 1886. No. 4.

LUTHERAN UNION.

THIRD ARTICLE.

The objections which have been brought against the principles of union set forth in these articles rest rather upon a feeling that something ungenerous is implied than upon a conviction that they are erroneous. It is certainly not the rule that nominal Lutherans, even if they are of the most "liberal" sort, will explicitly declare any portion of Scripture to be without authority or even without value, or any doctrine set forth in our Confessions as an article of faith to be a "damnable heresy" or even a positive error. On the contrary, we find it to be the rule rather that a recognition of the absolute supremacy of Holy Scripture, and of the Lutheran Confession as the historical criterion of the Lutheran Church, would be preferred, if this did not seem to involve positions and practices repugnant to their feelings. We therefore regard it needful for our purpose to add this third article, with a view to showing that our principles by no means imply the arrogance and harshness which are so frequently supposed to be contained in them, but that, as they are required by faith, they are in complete accord with the demands of charity.

I. It is argued, in the first place, that if we refuse to have church-fellowship with others who, while they profess to be Christians and to accept the Holy Scriptures, are not willing to accept the distinctive doctrines confessed by the Lutheran Church, we by implication deny them the right to the Christian name and refuse to recognize them as Christians; and by consequence we are presumed to deny that they can be saved.

The charge is so serious and weighs so heavily upon the heart that we do not wonder when men hesitate to accept principles against which it seems to lie. However plainly these principles may seem founded in the Word of God, the seeming implication bids men pause and reconsider the whole subject. Certainly we must abide by the truth once ascertained, whatever the consequences of such fidelity may be; but the question whether we have really ascertained the truth, when its consequences are so disagreeable, will arise again and again, and doubts will come that easily lead to denials in accordance with the impulses of the heart. We do not wonder that some are thus led to close their eyes against the truth. But it ought to occur to such persons that the error may lie in their thinking, and that the principle which, although it seems correct, they are disposed to renounce because of its disagreeable implications, may imply nothing of the kind that is charged against it. And that is really the fact in the case before us.

1. Let it be considered, first, that if our refusal to accept members into our churches, or to accord to people the rights and privileges belonging to members, so long as they refuse to declare themselves one with us in faith, implies that the persons thus excluded cannot, in our estima-

tion, be Christians, one of two things must be true in regard to all denominations; namely, they must either, by making certain requirements for membership in their churches, declare these to be absolutely essential to faith and salvation and thus deny that any are saved outside of their churches, or they must confess that they are demanding qualifications for membership in their churches without divine warrant, and thus declaring themselves to be sects, whose separate existence has its ground not in any divine requirement, but simply in the peculiar human notions of the persons who have agreed thus to organize a society on a generally Christian basis. Earnest men must look in the face the difficulty thus presented. If it is really so, that the maintenance of certain conditions of church membership and fellowship implies that the failure to comply with these conditions necessarily subjects the failing persons to the judgment that they are not Christians, then all denominations are in the same condemnation with Lutherans in making their denominational requirements, or they place themselves in a far deeper condemnation by setting up denominational barriers, but declaring at the same time that these barriers are mere human ordinances which only they, not Christians as such, are bound to observe. The condemnation in the latter case is double, because in violation of the Lord's command divisions are needlessly made among His people, and because these divisions are confessedly based on mere human ordinances, which no church has a right to insist upon as conditions of membership. No church has a right to demand as a condition of citizenship in the heavenly kingdom what the King Himself has not demanded as such condition. Such a demand would be plainly a usur-

pation of the Lord's prerogative and would manifest the disloyalty of the parties concerned. That is the very essence of sectarianism, to make laws for the Church which the Head of the Church has not made, and insist on these laws as conditions of membership. To us it is surprising that any intelligent Christian can for a moment accept such a preposterous theory. If sincere men will but reflect they must see that it is not only absurd, but irreverent and profane. If Christ is the Head of the Church, He must rule and man must submit to His authority. But then no one can be dispensed from the conditions of membership which He lays down. If Presbyterians or Methodists, Baptists or Papists profess to abide by these conditions and in every case insist on them, as they are bound to do in virtue of their profession that they are Christ's and are Christian churches, of course this will seem just as much to imply that they do not admit any others to be Christians, as it does when Lutherans profess to have the truth of Christ and insist on this as the condition of membership in Christ's Church. If any other denomination claims to have the truth, and insists on its distinctive doctrine because it is regarded as the truth, it must also share with us the obloquy of declaring those who reject these distinctive doctrines to be no Christians. But if any denomination does not claim to have the truth, and does not insist that its distinctive doctrines are confessed because they are biblical and must be insisted on because they are God's own truth, from the acceptance of which no one can be dispensed, what right has it to exist as a separate denomination of Christians? When a party confesses itself to be a miserable sect, that has a separate existence not even by any pretense of divine right, but only by making divisions

contrary to the doctrine which Christians have learned, it has nothing left to screen it from the contempt which it merits. Manifestly the same objection which is raised against the Lutheran Church and its conditions of union, must hold against any and every denomination that sincerely claims any divine right to exist as a separate Church. Where the objection would not hold, the sect stands self-condemned in its disloyalty to the Lord and His truth, and the situation is worse than that of Lutherans is presumed to be by those who raise the objection under consideration.

2. Let it be considered, secondly, that the objection urged against the Lutheran Church in view of the principles of union set forth, will lie with equal force against any Church or party that insists on divine truth as a basis of unity. Supposing that a wider platform than that presented by our Confession be adopted, what has been gained, so far as the charge is concerned that others, being excluded by the terms of union, are denied the Christian character? The most that could be claimed is, that the number of those excluded would be less, and that therefore the offense would be of less frequent occurrence. The objection, however, would hold in all its force; for if the spirit of arrogance and uncharitableness is introduced and fostered, it is of no importance, so far as the principle is concerned, whether its practice be of more or less frequency. If it is harsh and unkind for Lutherans to decline external church communion with those who refuse to accept the doctrine which they confess and upon the confession of which their visible organization is founded, it is equally harsh and unkind for unionists, who have laid aside such distinctions as separate the denominations from each other, still to insist that certain doctrines, however few or however general these may

be, must be accepted as an indispensable condition of fellowship. Moreover, if it is equivalent to denying that one who will not accept the Lutheran doctrine is a Christian, seeing that on that account he is not admitted into the Church and permitted to enjoy the privileges of her members, it is in like manner equivalent to denying that one who refuses to accept the broad creed of unionism is not a Christian, seeing that on that account he is excluded from the union organization of Christians and church people. Unionists are at variance in regard to the proper breadth of a union platform. In the nature of the case they must be so; for having abandoned the principle that all demanded by God's Word must be demanded by the Church, the only sure and settled basis of agreement is set aside and the whole subject referred for settlement to ever shifting and varying human opinion. May Lutherans have church fellowship with Calvinists or Arminians? May Baptists and Quakers be included in the Church league? May the lines be stretched so far as to embrace Romanists and not even exclude Universalists and Unitarians? Men of union proclivities are usually not given to much thought, and in most cases the difficulty of finding a limit beyond which even syncretistic liberality may not extend without forfeiting the claim to be Christian, has probably not occurred to them. But men that think will encounter the difficulty in pursuing union plans. If we may yield our Lutheran faith to accommodate a Reformed applicant for fellowship, why may we not yield our Lutheran faith to accommodate a Romanist? And if refusal to fellowship a Zwinglian is tantamount to declaring that he is not a Christian, is not refusal to fellowship a Romanist also tantamount to declaring that he is not a Christian? If it is bigoted and super-

cilious and heartless to make such a practical declaration in the one case, is it not bigoted and supercilious and heartless to make it in the other? Would it not, in the end, have to be adjudged cross-grained and cruel even to exclude Socinians or Mormons from the happy union, inasmuch as the ultimate ground, after all, is merely man's opinion? Manifestly, if the objection urged against us had any force whatever, that force would lie equally against any organization even of the most unionistic sort, supposing that it required any confession at all as a condition of admission or recognition as Christian.

3. But, thirdly, even a slight examination renders it plain, that the objection under consideration is entirely groundless, whether it be urged against Lutherans or against any other Christians who require faith as a condition of church membership and church privileges. It is true that the doctrine which the Lutheran Church confesses and the acceptance of which she requires as a condition of fellowship, she holds as the very truth of God which every Christian is bound to believe. She would in her practice be at war with one of her fundamental principles, if she imposed conditions of membership which God has not imposed. That would be a usurpation of power which in her eye is sacrilegious. Lutherans are not willing, and no Christian should be willing, to bend the neck to such yokes of human bondage. When the Lutheran Church insists that all who would enjoy her privileges must confess her faith, she means that hers is the Christian faith. She confesses because she believes, and she believes because the Lord hath spoken. We have no desire to evade the force of the objection by pleading that Lutherans have their own peculiar opinions as a particular denomination; that these,

being over and above the requirements made by the Scriptures, are not obligatory upon all; that all who would be Lutherans must accept them, but not all who would be Christians; that therefore it is slanderous to allege that we require all who would be Christians to accept our confession and that by implication we deny any one to be a Christian who refuses to accept it. We have no desire thus to muddle the whole subject and jeopardize the very principles for which we are contending. We admit our doctrine to be that the Lutheran Church confesses the truth revealed in Holy Scripture, and that the only claim she has for insisting on the acceptance of her confession as a condition of church fellowship is that God has bound this truth upon the consciences of all men. She would make herself a laughing-stock among the sects if she claimed divine authority for what she concedes to be the commandments of men, and expected that others would submit to the imposition as if it had divine warrant notwithstanding her concessions. Her faith is the Christian faith, the faith once delivered to the saints, and she asks men to accept it on no other ground than that God requires His people to accept it. If there is anything in the Lutheran Church that God has not required, or that is over and above the teaching and demand of Holy Scripture, that thing a person need of course not have in order to be a Christian, but neither does he need it in order to be a Lutheran. We not only admit the premise, but we assert it with all emphasis, that we can have no church fellowship with those who reject the truth confessed by the Lutheran Church, because they will not accept what the Bible teaches and makes obligatory upon all men, and what all Christians may justly be expected to accept. Our opponents are entitled to the benefit of whatever can be legitimately deduced from this.

But it can not be legitimately inferred that whoever declines to accept the Christian faith thus set forth by the Lutheran Church is therefore not a Christian. Those who draw such an inference fail to take into account several points that are essential to the argument.

In the first place, we wish no part or lot in the responsibility for the judgments which are pronounced, whether directly or indirectly, upon the hearts of our fellow men. In common with all other believers we claim the privilege of knowing the truth and judging whether prophets who come to us, speak according to the Word of God. In the exercise of this privilege we reject, as the Lord requires us to do, all false doctrine, i. e., all teaching that is not according to the Holy Scriptures. If any man come to us with such a false doctrine, though claiming to be a brother in Christ, the duty thus arising in regard to him is obvious. He must be shown his error. Because we cannot assume the responsibility of sanctioning his error by our act, inasmuch as we are forbidden to become partaker of others' sins, he can not be fellowshiped until the difficulty thus arising is removed. Whether he is a Christian or not is not the question. If his doctrine be not such that the very acceptance of it would imply the rejection of Christ and of Christianity, it is charitably to be presumed that he is a Christian. But that is a matter for God to judge, not man. We have no duty in that regard, except the duty enjoined on us in the words: "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Our business is with the external confession and the confessors' consequent relation to the external organization. The Lutheran, like all other churches, so far as the question of fellowship is concerned, is a visible church. If an applicant for membership has not the visible mark, namely,

the confession of Christ and of His words, he is not qualified for admission into the visible congregation. Whether he is a member of the invisible fold of Christ or not, notwithstanding his failure to show the requisite mark for our recognition, we need not decide. We may have our fears or doubts or hopes, according as the obstacle in the way of receiving him into visible fellowship is more or less serious, but it is not for us to judge, and our action, when we decline to receive him into fellowship because he does not confess the doctrines which our Lord requires, involves no such judgment.

In the second place, it is possible for a person to be a sincere Christian and thus to stand in spiritual fellowship with all other Christians in the invisible Church, and yet to lack the qualifications which must be demanded for his reception into the visible fellowship of Christians in the external church organization. Unquestionably the external is merely a manifestation of the internal, and nothing should be required for the latter that is not equally requisite for the former; in other words, if a person is really a Christian and thus a member of the spiritual body of Christ, he ought to be recognized as a Christian and not to be excluded from the visible organization in which that spiritual body becomes manifested. And so it undoubtedly would be, if men could know, as the Lord knows, what is in men. But men do not know this. They cannot read each other's hearts. Hence it comes to pass that some persons are received into the visible communion of the Church, who are not members of the Lord's body. We have fellowship with them because they have the visible marks requisite for Christian fellowship, and these are the only marks by which they are to be known among men. The marks by

which God knoweth them that are His are internal and cannot be made available for determining external fellowship. Hence it may occur, also, that as some are included in the visible community who are not really Christians, so some may be excluded whom our Lord recognizes as His disciples and who enjoy the spiritual fellowship of all Christians in the invisible Church. A person may be entangled in errors which the visible congregation could not tolerate without endangering the life of thousands and even millions of those for whom Christ died, and yet, so far as that visible congregation can know, be a person in whom the error has not become effectual for the destruction of faith in Christ, and who is therefore really a Christian, notwithstanding his lack of the needful criteria to be publicly recognized as such. Man cannot have the unerring knowledge which is the prerogative of God; he is forbidden to judge men's hearts; and therefore, in making his decision in reference to the persons whom he may externally fellowship, he is not called to decide the question whether they are Christians or not, which is impossible, but only whether they make the confession and lead the life which God's Word requires. To infer, therefore, that a person who is adjudged not to have the necessary outward marks entitling him to visible fellowship, is by that fact adjudged to be no Christian at all, is to confound things that are entirely distinct. We must decline to admit an unbaptized person to all the privileges of the Church, although we do not deny that he may have been regenerated by the Word of God, and therefore do not claim that he is excluded from church fellowship because he is no Christian. We must decline to admit children to the holy sacrament of the altar and thus have external sacramental fellowship with them, because

they are not able to examine themselves and thus to eat of this bread and drink of this cup, and therefore lack a qualification which the Scriptures require of communicants. It is false to infer that, because they are excluded from the holy communion which is designed for Christian believers, they are by implication declared to be no Christians. So we must decline to admit to church fellowship those who have not yet learned the truth which the Lutheran Church confesses, or who deny it when it is taught them, because the Scriptures requires men to accept and confess that truth, but it is false to infer that all such persons are necessarily pronounced unbelievers. In regard to many of them charity would judge rather that they are Christians, and that therefore when they are properly instructed they will accept the truth and thus possess the requisite qualifications for church fellowship.

II. It is argued, again, that if by excluding others we do not deny them to be Christians, we at least imply that we are better than they and thus evince the proud spirit of the Pharisee. This may be understood in several ways, but in whatever sense it may be taken, we deny that the inference is legitimate.

1. It may be understood to mean, in the first place, as charging that we regard ourselves morally better than our neighbors who belong to other churches. The charge is easily made, and in the temper of mind in which many regard what they call our exclusiveness it is quite natural that it should be made; but how is it to be established? How does our conviction that God requires the acceptance of the doctrine of the Gospel as a condition of fellowship, or, in other words, that to the true unity of the church it is necessary "to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gos-

pel and the administration of the sacraments," come to mean, when we endeavor to reduce it to practice, that we think ourselves holier than other people? In simple justice, to say nothing of charity, those who bring such grave accusations against us certainly ought to show us wherein our sin consists, before they condemn us as men who persist in sin notwithstanding the light given them. We have not the light, and we doubt whether any other person has the light which renders it manifest, that a man must have a fond conceit of his own holiness in order to become convinced that the unity of the Church rests upon the unity of faith, and that those who depart from the one faith revealed in Holy Scripture so far destroy the unity of the Church, or that he is an opinionated, self-sufficient Pharisee if he honestly lives according to his conviction. Even in matters of discipline as pertaining to morals such an inference is entirely unwarranted. Of course the cry is readily raised against those who rebuke avarice or drunkenness or gambling, that they think themselves better than other people, and the charge of pride and self-conceit has a certain plausibility, because the one who rebukes sin is presumed to hate it and not himself to practice it. But there is no ground whatever for the cry or the suppositions which underlie it. A person may certainly love his brethren, and in such love point out to them faults that endanger their souls, without implying that he in his own estimation is free from all faults. May not a person practice such charity towards his brethren with the sincere wish and the ardent hope that they will show the same kindness to him, and thus help him to discover and to put away faults which may become manifest in his life? May not a Christian in all humility render his brother the service of showing him

his sin, and giving him no rest until he renounces it, that his soul may be saved, though his sin is damned? The truth is, that those bringing such charges of pride and presumption against Christians who endeavor to execute the will of God in the government and discipline of the Church, have not yet learned the first principles of Christian faith and charity, and therefore think it arrogant to have faith and to insist upon the truth which it embraces, and proud and overbearing to have charity and to rebuke the errors and wrongs that jeopardize the soul. They would have us consent to let every man think and believe and do as he pleases, and yet have fellowship with them, as if all were right and salutary, notwithstanding that they teach and live otherwise than God's Word teaches, and would frighten us into disloyalty to the truth which we have learned by telling us that if we maintain it we will by such act be claiming superior holiness! Whatever such people, unlearned in the ways of the Lord, may surmise or impute to Lutherans, these will continue, in spite of all obloquy, to heed the instruction of the Holy Spirit: "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them." Rom. 16, 17.

2. It may be understood to mean, in the second place, that those who thus insist on the truth revealed in the Scriptures must regard themselves as intellectually superior to their neighbors, and thus have a fond conceit of their mental power that is not consistent with Christian humility. Now, it must be admitted that the maintenance of any doctrine as necessary for church fellowship does imply the knowledge of such doctrine and the conviction that it is the doctrine of Holy Scripture. It implies also that those who have such knowledge have so far an advantage over

those who do not have it, as it is better, far better, to know and believe the truth than not to know it, or to know and reject it. This we are quite ready to concede, and are perfectly willing that latitudinarians should make the most of it. But we humbly submit to all Christian people, whether it is proud self-conceit to profess a knowledge of Christ and of the salvation in Him, and to maintain the truth known from Holy Scripture against all gainsayers, however learned they may be. If that is arrogance and pride, no doubt all will see that it is inherent in the teaching of Christ, and therefore, so far as it can be urged as an objection, it lies against Christianity itself, not merely against Lutheranism. But the Bible teaches that believing the truth is a gift of grace, and those who suppose that such faith, including the knowledge which is one of its elements, exalts men in their own eyes, only testify against themselves. The experience of Christians generally will not bear them out in such a supposition. Against all such narrow and carnal argumentation we need simply to place the plain statements of our Lord: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," and of His apostle: "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." John 8, 31. 32; 2 John 9. 10. According to this we are to know the truth, not, in a mock humility which disparages the goodness of God in giving it and enabling us to see it, pretend not to know it; and if opponents think it mere self-conceit to believe the promise and heed the precept, we are content for Christ's sake to bear any accusations which their unscriptural thoughts may

impel them to make on account of our adherence to the Word of God.

3. We cannot refrain, thirdly, from giving expression to our solicitude with regard to those who raise the objections under consideration, and to lift the voice of warning against the whole conception whence it emanates. Christianity has been practically abandoned when it is once conceded that no man, without a spirit of pride and self-exaltation, can claim to have certain knowledge of the revealed truth, which God requires all men to receive, and persist in requiring the acceptance of this truth as a condition of communion in the Church. To one who has no knowledge, or at least no experimental knowledge of the truth revealed in the Bible, it might seem that modesty would require the unlearned Christian to surrender anything and everything that would be objectionable to any person desiring fraternal fellowship. If one objects to the doctrine of the means of grace, who am I that I should maintain it against men more learned and perhaps more holy than I, and insist on it even to the exclusion of the objector from church fellowship! If another objects to the doctrine of justification by faith, should not I, thinking others better than myself because I know myself better than I know any other, be willing to yield my faith in that regard in order not to exclude those who may be better than I and thus seem to exalt myself, most miserable of sinners that I am, above those others? Let Christians beware of the wiles of the devil, who appears as an angel of light to destroy their souls. That course seems to be dictated by humility, but it is the product of unbelief and thus of that pride at last which induced the fall of angels and of men. Why abandon the doctrine of the means of grace and of

justification by faith which the Bible so plainly teaches? Why, because some men, who desire Christian fellowship with us, dislike those doctrines and are not willing to subscribe them. Either we must let the doctrines go, or we must let those people go. We would like to retain them. They seem good men. If we exclude them, it would appear as if we presumed to judge in a difficult matter, in which they are perhaps better able to judge than we are. It is best to be humble, and presume that they have the truth. And so the tempter wins. He succeeds in getting the question reduced to one merely of human opinion, and of course these modest people will defer to almost any one who seems to have some learning and judgment. But the devil's victory consists in having the subject reduced to a sphere in which such a suggestion cannot be entertained at all. Who ever heard of its being modest to presume that God lies because some men are not prepared to accept his testimony. Who ever supposed that any one could be charged with a proud conceit of himself because, in a matter lying entirely beyond the reach of human faculties, be preferred to take the evidence of God, as against the evidence of men, who know nothing about it, but who dislike what the divine evidence establishes? Professing Christians would not so readily yield to the insinuations of the devil, if they would only consider and guard against deception. He succeeds by trickery and lies. It is a lie that the question of church fellowship is one merely of human opinion, by which all the terms are arranged, and of human good nature, by which the qualifications of persons are passed upon. If God had nothing to do with it, and the Church were a mere human organization, in which the terms of membership are wholly a matter of expediency and conventional arrangement, there

might seem to be some reason in reproaches of narrowness and exclusiveness and conceit of superior holiness. But then the subject would not be worth disputing about, and all reasonable people would accord to any of their neighbors the right to make the platform as wide or as narrow as the originators think best. It is the truth of God to which men raise objections. It is against insisting on this in all its parts that protests are raised. People want to be recognized as Christians without being bound to the whole truth which Christ has required His disciples to confess. So they want the divine truth to be reduced to the level of human opinion, in order that it may be set aside without the appearance of blasphemous presumption on the part of men daring to disparage or deny the Lord's word, but with the appearance of modest deference to the opinions of men, who may be presumed to know better than the simple Christian. When Satan once succeeds in getting the principle recognized by Christians, the victory is already won; for if one doctrine plainly revealed in Scripture can be set aside for the sake of conciliating some who desire to enter the Church, another doctrine will be just as readily yielded. If we can thus give up the doctrine of the means of grace, we can give up the doctrine also of the divinity of Christ; if it is pride and self-conceit to adhere to the one against men desiring fellowship, but finding that an obstacle, it is pride and self-conceit also to adhere to the other against men desiring fellowship, but finding that an obstacle. For the sake of the glory of their Lord and the salvation of the soul, that He has purchased, let men beware lest they be caught in the snares of the devil.

III. It is argued, in the third place, that we cannot consistently maintain our principles without maintaining

at the same time that those associations of professing Christians with whose members we decline to have church fellowship are not churches. In substance this has been answered under our first head, but as the form of the objection is different and as many seem to be misled by the fallacy in this form, it requires a brief exposition.

We are disposed to conceal nothing, believing that the truth of God, for which alone we desire to contend, can never gain aught, but always loses, by suppressing anything that forms part of it or helps more to understand it. We admit that our principle presumes the Ev. Lutheran Church to be the true visible Church of Christ on earth. But that does not mean that the Ev. Lutheran Church is the true holy Christian Church, whose existence we confess to be an article of our faith; it does not mean that there are no other churches besides the Ev. Lutheran Church; it means simply that among visible churches the Ev. Lutheran is the particular Church in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered.

I. The Ev. Lutheran Church does not claim to be the one Christian Church in which all believers are embraced, and when she insists that her Confession shall be accepted as a condition of ecclesiastical fellowship, she does not practically put forth such a claim. She holds that the Christian Church is composed of all true believers throughout the earth, whatever their special names may be, and therefore teaches that the one Church of Christ is in its nature invisible. By that she means that the essential condition of membership in the Church is faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. But as that is a matter purely of the heart, into which man is unable to see and which God alone can read, the Church is in that respect essentially invisible. All the members

are united to Christ by faith, and form His body. All these have spiritual fellowship with each other in the one body, although only the Lord knoweth them that are His; man can judge only by the professions, which he charitably assumes to be sincere, but which may be a mere form and pretense. It is only by the external professions that Christians recognize each other and form outward associations. Those who believe are to make known their faith by confession, and by their confession they are known. By their fruits shall ye know them. Thus visible organizations are formed in local congregations and in the more general associations formed by local congregations on the basis of agreement in their confession. Those who will not confess that which the brethren have recognized as the truth of God laid down in Holy Scripture, must of course abide by the consequence; they refuse to accept what the other Christians of the locality have acknowledged to be divine truth and thus to be obligatory upon all men, so that none can be received into fellowship who deny that truth. Now, it has happened that some who refused to confess this truth have sought association with others who were in agreement with them, and thus divisions were formed contrary to the doctrine which Christians had learned. In this way sects arose. This is deplorable, but it does not come through any fault of those who hold fast the pure truth. It comes from the sinfulness of men, who will not submit to the teaching of the Holy Spirit speaking through the Word. It would not remedy the evil, if Christians abandoned the truth for the sake of harmony and union. That would be fatal. The result would be that instead of erring sects we would have an erring Church; that is, that instead of a party, the whole body would become corrupt. On account

of the sinfulness of man, divisions and heresies are unavoidable, and it would be suicidal to endeavor to guide them by yielding to the wishes of errorists. Among the works of the flesh St. Paul enumerates heresies; Gal. 5, 20; and the same apostle declares: "There must also be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." 1 Cor. 11, 19. The sinfulness of man interferes with the unity of the Church, as it interferes with every other good thing on earth. It causes rends and divisions where there ought to be one faith and one confession, and where brethren ought to live together in harmony. But it cannot rend the body of Christ in its spiritual essence, that remains one in spite of the outward divisions, and it embraces all, in whatever outward connection they may be found, who sincerely believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as their Savior. That one Church of Christ, composed of all true believers, the Lutheran Church does not profess to be. There are some in her visible organization who are not true believers and therefore not members of the Church, and there are some true believers and thus members of the one Church who are not in the visible fold called the Evangelical Lutheran.

2. But the Ev. Lutheran Church does claim that she is the visible organization that has the pure doctrine of the Gospel and the pure administration of the sacraments, and that she is therefore the true visible Church of God on earth. She does not claim to be anything more than a visible organization of Christianity, like all other visible church organizations, but she does claim to be the only one among the numbers of visible churches that fully complies with the Lord's will. This implies that she cannot consider all denominations as equally existing by divine warrant, but

that the Church which confesses the pure truth of the Gospel is the only one that has a legitimate existence.

Some organizations that profess to be Christian cannot, because they lack the essentials of Christianity, be recognized as such at all. But not all those that can on account of their generally Christian creed be admitted to be Christian, can be admitted also as having a right to exist as special churches. The question then is not whether they are churches or congregations of Christians at all or not, but whether as such churches they exist according to the Lord's will. And to this question our answer is emphatically in the negative. The Lord's will is that all should hold the truth which He has given us in His holy Word; and although men may be made Christians by the means of grace and may form churches, notwithstanding errors into which they may have fallen, just as they may be Christians notwithstanding the sins which they may daily commit, yet the will of the Lord is that they should know the truth and renounce all error, just as it is His will that they should put away sin. Whilst those who obstinately persist in false doctrine, in spite of all the instruction that is given from the Word of God, are not to be regarded as Christians, because they refuse to be guided by the Holy Spirit, it would be uncharitable to assume that all those in connection with an erring denomination are wilful errorists. Many of them probably know nothing of the origin of their sect and have had no opportunity to learn the error of its doctrine, which, in their simplicity, they have accepted as the doctrine of the Bible. We have no right to assume that they are not churches, but are required to believe that they are, so long as their teaching is not such as would make it impossible for those receiving it to be Christians at all. But

whilst we recognize them as churches, we would have to contradict our professions as Lutherans if we recognized them as pure churches. If they are such, the Lutheran Church is not. No reasonable man could expect Lutherans, unless he supposed them to be making hollow pretensions when they confess their faith, to declare others right and they themselves wrong. Any honest man that thinks so would abandon his church and connect himself with one that is loyal to its Lord and confesses the truth in its purity. That is what the Lutheran Church does, and that is the reason that we cannot regard other churches, which are other churches, because they have a different doctrine, and which would cease to be other churches if they accepted the pure Gospel which the Lutheran Church confesses, as having equal divine warrant for their existence. Error has no divine warrant, and a church that has its distinctive existence only on the ground of error, by reason of which it stands separate from the Church which confesses the truth and forms a division contrary to the doctrine which we have learned from the Scriptures, can have no divine warrant for its existence. It may be a church notwithstanding its being a sect, that is, notwithstanding its holding fast error and thus causing divisions, but if it would do the will of God it would abandon its errors and cease making these a partition wall between itself and the pure church, i. e., the Church of the pure Word and Sacrament.

It is difficult to believe that any who have devoutly studied the Scriptures and have taken these as their guide can seriously entertain the opinion, that the different denominations of Christians are all equally authorized parts of the Church, all of which taken together form the whole. Whether this be meant geographically or specifically, it is

unscriptural and absurd. The facts are such that one must be blind to believe that, e. g., the Romish Church is really the Church of Italy, the Lutheran of Germany, the Protestant-Episcopal of England. What is the Church then of these United States? All can see that no one of the denominations has a separate existence merely in view of territorial limits. The Church of Rome is no more confined to Italy than is the Lutheran Church to Germany; and the Lutheran Church no more recognizes the divine right of Romanism in Italy than it does in Germany. It is a sect that has no divine warrant for its existence anywhere. People are only deceiving themselves when they try to believe that the whole unhappy business of church divisions can be justified by such a dream of separation on merely geographical grounds. But just as little is the theory tenable that the various denominations are merely species, all of which together form the general Christian or Christian Church. That would imply that Christ organized different churches, each differing from the other and all possibly occupying the same territory. The opinion is too wild to merit serious refutation. It is the sect spirit driven to desparation for some show of plausibility. We read nothing in Scripture of the organization of such various churches specifically different but generally one. But we do read warnings against all divisions, and admonition to preserve the unity of the children of God. "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism." Eph. 4, 4. 5. The one body of believers in Christ becomes manifest in its confession of Him and the truth by which He is revealed to man. In their knowledge and consequently in their confession, they may vary without necessarily ceasing to be Christians.

But those who continue in the Lord's word shall know the truth, and their confession must be a preservative against the power and prevalence of error. Those who have that truth must insist on it. The glory of the Lord and the salvation of souls, which are constantly endangered by error, demands this. And they who have this truth, and are organized on the basis of its acceptance by all, constitute the true visible Church of Christ, with which all should unite.

We are Lutherans because we believe the Lutheran Confession to be the expression of the pure faith of the Gospel. Therefore we cannot otherwise than insist that the intelligent and honest acceptance of the Scripture requires the acceptance of the Lutheran Confession, although there may be Christians and churches that are abnormal and do not accept it. L.

THE OFFICE OF FAITH.

Now that the grace of God has appeared bringing salvation to all men, no one need die in his sins. All, indeed, have sinned and come short of the glory of God; but "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 5, 20–21. Christ, in giving himself as ransom for all, is thereby become the Savior of all men. Having through the eternal Spirit and in His own body condemned sin and abolished death, there is now among men no sin unto death except one, to-wit, the sin of rejecting, persistently rejecting, the Christ of God

their Savior; for he that believeth not shall be damned. Away from Christ, and without Him, sin is as hurtful and deadly to man now as ever it was; nay, since with so great a price God has made a way of escape, the sin of abiding in sin has become all the more sinful and must entail the greater damnation on those who are guilty of it. "For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He that believeth on Him, is not condemned; but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that Light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than Light, because their deeds were evil." John 3, 17–19.

Only he that believeth, believeth to the end, shall be saved. The fulness of saving grace that is in Christ Jesus for men, can not avail to their salvation except it be imparted to them by God and they themselves appropriate it. The peculiar heart-action whereby such appropriation takes place, the Scriptures almost invariably call faith. This is so well known that no passages need be cited in proof of it. The only question of dispute among Christians is in what sense and to what extent men are saved through faith; whether through faith or on account of it; and again, whether through faith alone or by works also.

That the sinner, if saved at all, is saved through faith and through faith alone, about that the Scriptures leave no room for doubt. "For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast."

Eph. 2, 8–9.—*διὰ τῆς πιστεως.* Hardly ever, says *Winer*, is this preposition employed to denote the *causa principalis.* That it is here used to designate the *causa apprehendens*, the appropriating instrument, is evident from the other words of the passage. Were faith here taken into consideration as a cause effecting, or as a virtue deserving, or as a work meriting salvation, then were salvation not by grace but by works, then would it be a wages and not a gift — all of which is in direct contradiction to the plain sense of the words here used and of the teachings of Scripture everywhere. "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift — *τὸ δὲ χάρισμα* = the free gift — of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord." Rom. 6, 23. "Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith — *πίστει* = *διὰ πίστεως*, *Meyer* — without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3, 28. "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith — *διὰ πίστεως* — of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Gal. 2, 16.

If in these and similar passages faith is taken in the sense of its correlate, that is, as a deed of the law, then is the antithesis between the two completely wiped out; and the Apostle would be made to say: ye are not justified by the deeds of the law, and yet are ye justified by one deed of the law, namely by faith. That, however, not a mere distinction but a direct antithesis between faith on the one hand and the deeds of the law on the other, is here intended and clearly expressed, every one of unbiased mind will admit. Righteousness and salvation are through faith of Jesus Christ unto all and

upon all them that believe — and this in spite of sin and wholly apart from any deed of the law, faith itself included in so far as it may be of itself the law's fulfillment; for men are justiffed freely by the grace of God through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Salvation by grace, and salvation through faith is but the same truth expressed from different points of view. The one expression sets forth that salvation is altogether the work and gift of God's free grace; the other, that it can be had by accepting it as a free gift and in no other way. In the very nature of things: salvation must lose its character as a free gift, if by any virtue or work in men and by them, these render themselves worthy or deserving of it. No, only then when we conceive of faith as the appropriating means to it, does salvation remain what the Scriptures everywhere proclaim it to be, namely, the free gift of ineffable grace. "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith." Rom. 3, 27.

That with regard to the saving grace and all the spiritual gifts of God faith is really the instrument of appropriation, the ouly instrument to that end and, within these limits, an instrument of appropriation only, is so obvious from the teachings of the Scriptures, that in most if not in all of its utterances the words believe and receive or accept can, with entire safety, be used interchangably. An actual example of this is given us by St. John. Speaking of Christ as the true Light of the world, he says of Him that "He came unto His own, but His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God,

even to them that believe on His name." Cap. 1, 11–12. Here the past ἔλαβον finds its continuity in the present πιστεύουσιν, so that the action of both verbs with reference to Christ must be essentially the same. The one expresses the first taking, the other the continued holding of Christ. In full harmony with this view of faith is the beautiful metaphor long in use among the teachers of our Church, according to which faith is the hand of the heart, with which the latter apprehends Christ its Savior and secures unbroken possession of Him. To say that faith is that action of the regenerated heart whereby it lays hold of and clings to Christ, may not be the most scientific or philosophical definition but it certainly is the most scriptural and satisfactory one.

That Christ and our salvation by Him are in no sense whatever a wages neither of faith nor of anything subjective, be it antecedent or consequent to it,—that both are the free gifts of pure grace, which become ours simply and solely by the taking of them—so strenuously does the Word of God insist on this, that it declares the very attempt to possess oneself of Christ in any other way than by that of taking Him as a Gift freely bestowed, to amount to a rejection of Him. "Christ is become of no effect unto you—ye are severed from Christ, ye—who would be justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Col. 5, 4. Yea, that the notion of worthiness in anything man is, or of merit in anything man can do before God, has at all entered the human mind, is one of the most deplorable evidences of man's entire perversion. To think that he should be somebody or do anything of which the great God were bound in equity to take account, is of all sins the most

presumptuous and damnable. Of worthiness and merit before God there could be no thought, strictly speaking, even had man abided in his first estate; how much less, now that he has fallen from God and become totally corrupt. "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do," says Christ to His disciples. Luke 17, 10. And of this their entire unprofitableness before God, godly men have been conscious at all times and freely made confession. "By the grace of God I am what I am," says St. Paul, "and His grace which was bestowed upon me, was not in vain; but I labored more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." 1 Cor. 15, 10. And this enriching and quickening grace of God was his, and can be ours, only through faith in Christ Jesus. It is not to be denied, that faith as a work and gift of divine grace is in itself a virtue also, a living power fruitful of good works, and that therefore it has another office beside the one under consideration at present; but of that more anon. With respect to the benefits and gifts of God, however, in so far as they are intended for our salvation, faith is simply

RECEPTIVE,

and this is its first and chief office. How, and with what blessed results it executes this office, is a matter that deserves to be looked into more closely.

The object apprehended by saving faith is Christ Jesus, "who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption," as St. Paul

writes, 1 Cor. 1, 30; "And," as St. John declares, 1, 16, "of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace."

Christ is made unto us wisdom. This is not the essential wisdom of the Deity, for Christ *is made* unto us wisdom: of this the former, however, is the eternal source. Neither is it the wisdom of God made manifest in the creation of the world; for *Christ* is made unto us wisdom. It is the wisdom of God thought out for our redemption, thought out before the foundation of the world was laid and executed in the fulness of time. The only begotten Son of the Father in His divine-human personality and in His character as the Savior is the embodiment of it; so that in Him are hid all the treasures of this wisdom and knowledge, Col. 2, 3. Hid, but to be made manifest and to become ours; 1 Cor. 2; for *unto us* is He made wisdom. And it becomes ours, not when we know it simply, or understand it, nor yet when we assent to its truthfulness and reality — though all this is necessary; but it becomes ours when the heart lays hold of the substance of it as a treasure worthy of all acceptation. Christ is the saving wisdom for all; but He is in the actual possession of those only who have received Him through faith. That they may thus receive Him, to this end is Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God, preached unto men. The Gospel of Christ, which has this saving wisdom for its substance, is therefore also the power of God unto salvation only to them that believe. Only through faith in Christ Jesus are men made wise unto salvation by the Scriptures. Rom. 1, 16. 1 Tim. 3, 15. The reason why a mere knowledge of its teachings and a mere assent to its truthfulness are not sufficient to acquire this wisdom, but that a full

faith is necessary to its obtaining, lies in the fact that this is a wisdom most real and replete with blessings. It is the wisdom of God, not only because it is of Him but because it is, at the same time, the means whereby He communicates Himself and His saving grace, so that they who receive the Gospel of it have the divine treasure also with which it is freighted.

Christ is made unto us righteousness. This is one of the first and chief treasures which constitute the substance of the wisdom whereunto Christ is made for us. The righteousness here spoken of is that which Christ, both according to His human and His divine nature, acquired for mankind in order to their justification before God. Upon Him were laid the sins of the whole world. Taking the sinners' place, He made Himself responsible for him before the all-holy and righteous God. He fully assumed the guilt of men, and completely paid its penalty. He was put under the law for them and in their place, and for them did all the will of God. Such, in a few words, is the import of the declaration that Christ is made unto us righteousness. But this righteousness which is objectively ours by a certainty divine, must as really and certainly become ours subjectively also before it can serve the end for which it has been acquired, that is, justify us before God. To put it into our possession, God, by ways and means of His own appointment, brings it near to us and offers it for our acceptance. But to this giving on the part of God there must be a taking on our part; if not, then saving mercy labors in vain and we remain in our sins, notwithstanding the fact that all our guilt is atoned for and all our debt is paid. Hence the absolute necessity of faith, and that faith also here do its office,

that is, appropriate Christ our righteousness. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also described the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works. Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin . . . Now it was not written for his (Abraham's) sake alone, that it was imputed to him. But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Rom. 4. (Cf. cap. 3; 2 Cor. 5, 21; Phil. 3, 9; etc.). Faith is counted or reckoned for righteousness; that is, it is not in itself this righteousness, nor does it as a virtue or work justify the ungodly. For justification, as it is expressly here stated, consists in this that sins are *covered*, that iniquities are *forgiven*, and that righteousness, i. e., the righteousness of Christ, V. 24–25, is *imputed*. Now correlative to this forensic act of God of reckoning or attributing righteousness the only action conceivable on the part of man the beneficiary, is that of appropriation, that is, of believing. Hence, "if we believe," etc. V. 24. The believer therefore is declared just, not on account of his faith, but on account of the perfect righteousness of Christ, which is imputed to him and which he lays hold of and holds by faith in Christ. Furthermore, when the Scriptures declare him blessed

who is thus justified, it is evident that every gift of grace, that God's entire salvation is bestowed on man simply and solely on account of Jesus' righteousness. "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Rom. 5, 1–2. Moreover:

Christ is made unto us sanctification, so that we might not only be declared righteous, but be made righteous also. God has sent His Son into the world to save His people from their sins, and that from the dominion of sin no less than from the guilt and wages of it. Justified through faith in Christ, the sinner is fully and perfectly absolved of all his guilt and exempted from all its penalties as such, the perfect obedience of his divine substitute covering the one and freeing him from the other; he is a child of God and an heir to eternal life, a Christian. But viewed simply with respect to the righteousness graciously imputed to him, we do not as yet see in him the ideal child of God, the full stature of the man of God which he is to be. The ultimate purpose of God in His redemption of man, and with respect to him, is, that he be restored to his first estate of holiness, and hence, that man be himself made holy again. And to this his sanctification by God, God's justification of him constitutes the ground, the way and the means. Therefore, these two divine operations, the one in behalf of, and the other in man, though they are entirely different things, are yet inseparably connected. The one, his sanctification, invariably sets in with the other, his justification. And this by the very nature

of things; for a man will never lay hold of God and righteousness, unless, in somewhat at least, he prizes them; neither can he enjoy them unless a heart be given him that takes delight in them. And this is the beginning of sanctification; for holiness is nothing other than the love of God and of things godly. However, what must concern us here, is the office of faith with respect to sanctification. The faith that lays hold of Christ, lays hold of all things that are His, and therefore also of the Spirit of Christ, and of all the Spirit's virtues and graces. A new life and life-powers must be given us, before we can be renewed in heart and do what is acceptable before God. But if given, then must they be taken; and this again we do through faith, for through faith in Christ are we sanctified. Acts 26, 18. By the Holy Ghost the love of God to us — ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ, the genetive subject — is shed abroad in our hearts, Rom. 5, 5; and this love begets in us a return of love, that is, holiness of heart; but now is the Holy Ghost given us, according to the same passage; and since a gift, He can be ours only through faith. Hence the Apostle's rebuke of the foolish Galatians who departed from this truth: "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" Gal. 3, 2. And St. John writes that whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God, loves Him who has begotten Him and all that are begotten of Him, (I, 5, 1, etc.); and, as St. Peter expresses it, he is become a partaker of the divine nature (II, 1, 1, etc.). But, unlike our justification which as a judicial act is made perfect in an instant, our sanctification is a creative act of God and continues throughout life. While on

earth, sin dwells in us, besets us from all sides, hurts and grieves us; therefore, also,

Christ is made unto us redemption, and this is an earnest of our final deliverance from all evil, whether of body or soul. The day shall come when our warfare with the powers of darkness shall cease, when our victory over the world shall be made complete as for us so through us also, when sin shall no longer tempt us nor any sorrow be able to reach our souls, and when we shall rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory in the very presence of Him who has loved us and saved us. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to His abundant mercy, has begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time, wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season (if need be) ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations, that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried by fire, might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ . . . receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." 1 Pet. 1, 3, etc. Here again we observe that, with respect to all the gracious and precious promises of God still awaiting fulfillment, faith and hope — which latter is nothing but faith grasping things to come — are declared as being the appropriating element. "We are made partakers of Christ," says the word of God to the Hebrews, 3, 14, "if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end."

In a summary, then, Christ is ours through faith by the operation of God. And in Christ are enclosed, and for us, all the grace, the works, the gifts and the virtues of the God of our salvation, so that having Christ we have all things: and we have Him through faith.

Now in view of the divine and living character of the fulness from which faith takes and continues to take, it were strange indeed if the office which it thus exercises, did not lead to a second; if it were always to take and never to give. Where there is such a filling up, we naturally expect an overflow; and in this we are not disappointed, for by virtue and in consequence of its receptive office, faith becomes

OPERATIVE

also, and this with respect to God and men and all the affairs of God and men. Whatever is given to faith and apprehended by it becomes the property of beings endowed with intelligence, sensibilities and will-power; and, it cannot be otherwise, upon these faith with its fulness must have a vivifying as well as an enriching effect. Men must have thoughts and feelings and volitions concerning the wealth of things brought to them and made their own possession, as also with respect to Him from whom they all proceed. So certain may we be about this that wherever we find it otherwise, faith is a delusion and a pretense in him who makes profession of it. "Faith, if it hath not works, is dead in itself." James 2, 17, R. V.

Nothing can be clearer from the Scriptures than that faith is, by the will of God, designed to be operative, and that, wherever it is genuine, it is a living power fruitful of good works. "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision

availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." Gal. 5, 6. Faith, by the divine substance which it has received, begets love—a grateful love towards its divine Benefactor and a beneficent love toward mankind as the works of His hands and the objects of His redemption. By this love the believer gives thanks and praise, honor and adoration to his God and abounds in deeds of kindness toward his fellow men; and in such doings consists the operation of faith. "We love Him, because He first loved us." 1 John, 4, 19. God is love, and He is the well-spring of all love that deserves the name of it. By faith in Christ we have first known and realized that He loves us, and so drawn from His love to fulness of joy; and then, with this love to us, faith has quickened us with love to Him, so that the holy stream flows to us, and through us back to the throne of God carrying with it fruits sweet to His taste. Sweet to the taste even of the all-holy God, since they are presented to Him by faith through Christ, who covers all their imperfections. The thank-offerings which the believer thus brings to God for all the gifts and benefits received of Him through Christ are manifold. "For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments; and His commandments are not grevious." 1 John 5, 3. In short, the Christian believer endeavors to walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work and thankful for all things.

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3, 31. Grace, and grace alone, is the source of our entire salvation; Christ, and Christ alone, is the ground and mediator of it; faith, and faith alone, appropriates it and holds it in possession; and faith, and faith alone, gives all the glory to God. In every

sense is Christ the end of the law to every one that believeth: first in this, that Christ has done the law for him to his salvation; and then also in this that the man justified, sanctified, and saved, and thus brought to newness of life, himself does it with glad and grateful heart to praise Him who has loved him with a love that passes all understanding. C. H. L. S.

ENVIRONMENT AND CHARACTER.

An address before the Alumni of Capital University, Monday evening, June 14, 1886, by Rev. E. Pfeiffer.*

It is said, and it is a matter of every day experience, that "circumstances alter cases." And, in a broad sense, among the cases which circumstances change, human character is included. Men differ not only in nature, in natural endowments and native qualities, but also in surroundings, in the advantages and disadvantages of their respective environments. The character and attainments of persons of equal natural qualification will be different, according as they are differently circumstanced. And it is not merely an interesting problem of mental and moral philosophy, but a subject of practical importance and interest, to trace the relation that subsists between a person's character and his environment, or the aggregate of surroundings and circumstances by which he may be affected, to discover, largely from observation and the facts of human experience, the power of environment to affect, change and mould character, as well as the limitations of its power.

"Shortly after Chief-justice Chase had gone for the first time to Washington, he was returning to the West. The

* Published by request.

train stopped at a little station in Virginia, and he was informed that it was the birth-place of Patrick Henry. He immediately left the car and stood upon the platform, admiring the magnificence of the scenery that opens before the traveler. He said, 'What an atmosphere! What a view! What glorious mountains! No wonder that Patrick Henry grew here!' One of the natives who was standing by his side quietly replied, 'Yes sir, but as far as I have heard, that landscape and these mountains have always been here; but we haven't seen any more Patrick Henrys.'"* Doubtless, that romantic scenery and those rugged mountains had a stimulating, elevating influence on the soul of Patrick Henry, as such surroundings have on all sensitive natures, but more than this is needed to make gifted statesmen and brilliant orators. Wilbur Crafts, who tells the story, adds this illustration of the difference: "Two seeds are planted in the same environment of soil and sunlight. One grows into an oak, and the other becomes only a cabbage-head." If, without personal effort, attention and application, a person depends on his fortunate surroundings to make him good and great and successful in life, the reverse will doubtless be his portion. For, as Longfellow says,

> "The heights by great men reached and kept
> Were not attained by sudden flight,
> But they, while their companions slept,
> Were toiling upward in the night."

Perseverance, diligence and earnest purpose are no less requisite for the work of character-building than for the successful accomplishment of any other enterprise.

* W. F. Crafts, "Successful Men of To-day."

The individual character is not at the mercy of its environment. It is neither bound to sink in an unfavorable environment, nor bound to rise under the most favorable circumstances. The facts of history demonstrate that there is a possibility of being an honest man and a Christian in the most unhappy and trying surroundings, and likewise, that it is possible to be a rogue when all surrounding circumstances favor the cultivation of honesty and integrity. Much depends on the personal will and courage and energy and other qualities of soul, whether a person shall surmount difficulties and rise above unfavorable circumstances, or sink beneath them and succumb ; whether he shall take advantage of favorable environments, or abuse those advantages to his own ruin and the injury of his race and the dishoner of his God. Emerson goes so far as to affirm that "no change of circumstances can repair a defect of character." A moral coward, for example, will be a coward under all circumstances. An irascible disposition will attain its irritability in the calmest and most peaceful atmosphere. But if circumstances cannot repair a defect of character, their influence is nevertheless considerable as regards the mitigation or aggravation of such infirmities.

Whilst, therefore, man is not the creature of circumstances, the plastic power of environment over character is undeniably great and needs to be taken account of in all disciplinary and educational enterprises and reformatory movements. If the proverb, "Circumstances make men," is false, it is yet true, as the facts of biography and experience show, that circumstances at least help to make men and play a very considerable part in the formation of character. The process begins in earliest infancy and extends through life. In every period, more especially in early life,

the soul is susceptible to impressions which its surroundings naturally make upon it. Children learn largely by imitation and example. And from the same source the larger part of humanity gets its training. Burke says, "Example is the school of mankind, and they will learn at no other."

The most important factor in the environment of every human being, that which is more potent than any other in moulding character, *is the home.* The importance of this nursery and training school of life can hardly be overestimated. What sacred memories, what tender associations encircle, like a halo, the home of our childhood and exert a marked influence on our thoughts and actions still! What gave Howard Payne a world-wide reputation and lent his simple ballad, "Home, sweet Home!" an irresistible charm that has oft-times excelled, in power of fascination, the sublimer compositions of the masters, is the fact that he selected for his theme of song the centre of the purest affections and deepest emotions and most potent influences of earth. No matter whether it was a rich home or a poor home, as the world rates riches, whether we were rocked in the cradle of comforts and luxuries, or breathed the atmosphere of poverty and self-denial, whether the mother on whose bosom we nestled, at whose feet we knelt, was embellished by distinguished talents, peculiar graces and refinements, or merely adorned by Christian humility, simplicity and sincerity, if only the home was home indeed, and the mother a true mother,

> "Home of our childhood! How affection clings
> And hovers around thee with her seraph wings!"

And those unfortunate mortals who cannot think of their home with affection and delight, think of it with regret and

bitterness,—but think of home they must, all who have issued from this preparatory school of life and divinely appointed mother and nurse of character. They have not come forth from these retreats as moral blanks, ready to receive first impressions, helpless and shapeless. On the contrary, in the race and battle of life men prove to be, to a large extent, what home influences have made them. The early impressions made upon the youthful mind, which, as some writer has said, is "like wax to receive but like marble to hold," the examples of good or evil that have been imitated and have become a part of the child's very being, the desires awakened, the habits formed, the tastes and affections cultivated, the virtues or vices fostered and nurtured, —in short, the qualities and traits of character formed under the influence of home-surroundings accompany a person through life, largely determining his future career and qualifying his future attainments.

All experience and observation agree in attributing to the mother by far the larger share of power and influence in that sphere for which God peculiarly fitted and expressly designed her. The mother, rather than the father, is practically the every day model of her children. Of her they learn before their lips have uttered an intelligible word. While the Word of God charges the father in particular with the duty of bringing up his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, whilst he, as the appointed head and natural protector and guide of the family, has or ought to have great power in shaping the surroundings of the home and giving the proper tone to the family life, it is yet true that the maternal influence for good or for evil is most powerful, oftentimes prevailing over the counter influence of the father. Good mothers have been known to rear

families of well-behaved and well-to-do children in spite of the father's reckless and dissolute habits and evil example. But however good and wholesome the influence of the father, let the wife and mother lose her womanly traits and become brutish, let her example and influence be evil and evil continually, and you will invariably find the fruits of such influence culminating in poor houses and insane asylums and prisons.

The men who have risen above their fellows and become distinguished in any sphere of life for peculiar attainments and great achievements, have, in the great majority of cases, derived the elements of their character from maternal care bestowed on them in childhood. The mothers of what are regarded great men of the race were women of great and decided force of character. Run over the list of the world's great statesmen and distinguished generals; you will find this to be the case throughout. And not only is this true of the world's heroes, those who have risen to prominence in the State. It is no less true of those who have arisen in the Church as the faithful teachers and champions of the truth. Take those of whom mention is made in the sacred Scriptures, look into the biographies of the church fathers of old, examine the childhood of the illustrious servants of God from earliest eras down to our own time and generation, you will find them all, without exception, to have been the sons of pious and faithful mothers. "Nor is it only from the great and illustrious in the Church that we may collect such facts. Look around you and see what are the families from which religion derives its most devoted and faithful friends." From what dwellings come those who love the habitation of the Lord's house, who prize and faithfully use the means of grace, who consistently confess Christ's name

before men and are foremost in efforts to spread His Gospel through the world? Do they come from families whose mother is devoted to the vanities and frivolities and vices of the world rather than to the verities of the kingdom of heaven? "Far from it. They come, and come almost exclusively, from households where the mother is a Christian, where the nursery for the family is a nursery for the Church, where the first lispings of childhood are accents of prayer, and the first thoughts of the heart, thoughts of God and of His Christ."*

"Just as the twig is bent, the tree's inclined." And the person who, above all other persons, has glorious opportunities of bending the twig while it is young and green, of shaping and giving direction to the character while the mind is yet flexible and ductile, is the mother.

The maternal influence for evil is equally, if not more powerful. Numerous illustrations of this sad fact might be gleaned from history and personal observation. The deplorable characteristics of Lord Byron are said to have been "traceable, in no small degree, to the adverse influence exercised upon his mind from his birth by his capricious, violent and headstrong mother," who could so far forget herself as to taunt her son with his personal deformity. Byron seems to allude to the terrible results of such training in the lines,

> "Untaught in youth my heart to tame,
> My springs of life were poisoned."

An amusing incident is told in the life of Samuel Toote, the actor, showing how curiously the character of a mother may be repeated in her son. Though Mrs. Toote had been

*Dr. J. M. Matthews.

heiress to a large fortune, she soon spent it all and was at length imprisoned for debt. In this condition she wrote to her son, who had been allowing her a hundred a year out of the proceeds of his acting: "Dear Sam, I am in prison for debt; come and assist your loving mother, E. Toote." To which her son characteristically replied, "Dear mother, so am I; which prevents his duty being paid to his loving mother by her affectionate son, Sam Toote."

Since home influences are such an important factor in character-building, and the mother exerts such a large share of these influences, how important is it for our individual good as well as for our national prosperity that our homes be filled and governed by good mothers. Wilbur Crafts advises those who would be successful in life to select a good grandmother. And this apparently ridiculous and impracticable feat he explains by saying, "You are selecting a good grandmother or the opposite for the coming man in your wedding of to-day, besides selecting a secret of your own success or failure." Let the young men of to-day discard the frivolous, shallow-minded and fickle-hearted ladies of society and fashion, let them choose for wives young women of good womanly sense and Christian honesty and sincerity, combined with an ordinary measure of intelligence,—a species of which mankind fortunately has not been wholly devastated—,and in so doing, besides contributing mightily to their own force of character and the success of their life-work, they will be conferring upon their children and children's children the unparalleled advantage and inestimable blessing of good mothers and grandmothers.

Another important and influential element in a person's environment, as regards character, *is companionship and associa-*

tion. It is a common saying that men are known by the company they keep. There is probably not a language, among civilized or pagan races, that has not one or more pointed proverbs asserting this remarkably accurate test of character. "Live with wolves," says the Spanish proverb, "and you will learn to howl." Not only are men inclined, for the sake of avoiding discomfort and annoyance, to adapt themselves voluntarily to their surroundings, so that, when in the company of wolves, they will howl rather than appear singular and imperil their interests, but it is impossible for one to associate with wolves without acquiring wolfish manners and habits. As surely as water seeks a level, so surely will persons who associate freely tend to become like each other. So great is the power of example, and so natural and active the faculty of imitation, that this process of assimilation is inevitable. And the weaker nature will always gravitate or be attracted toward the stronger, though neither will remain utterly unaffected by the other. Those persons who have the greatest force and decision of character, whether in the line of good or of evil, will exert the greatest influence on those who are relatively weak, indetermined and irresolute. Some are naturally qualified to be leaders in the spheres of life which they occupy, whilst others are more adapted to follow as they are led. "There is a contagiousness in every example of energetic conduct. The brave man is an inspiration to the weak and compels them, as it were, to follow him. Thus Napier relates that at the combat of Vera, when the Spanish centre was broken and in flight, a young officer, named Havelock, sprang forward and, waving his hat, called upon the Spaniards within sight to follow him. Putting spurs to his horse, he leaped the abatis which protected the French

front and went headlong against them. The Spaniards were electrified; in a moment they dashed after him, cheering for the fair boy, and with one shock they broke through the French and sent them flying down hill."* And so all great generals and reformers and leaders of society have been characterized by this power to electrify those about them, to instill their superior energy and enthusiasm into their less energetic and zealous fellowmen, and thus, to a greater or less extent, to stamp their mind and character on their age and nation, as Luther did on Germany, and Knox on Scotland, and Dante on modern Italy.

The positive character has a similar power in ordinary life. It acts like a magnet that attracts surrounding particles and charges them with magnetism, or like an infection that communicates itself to those with whom it comes in contact. Naturally, the power of example and companionship is most noticeable and influential during youth. While the habits of thought and conduct are forming and the minds of the young peculiarly susceptible to impressions and changes, their associations are of the utmost weight and importance in the formation of their character. The advice which Dr. Thomas Arnold, the distinguished principal of Rugby school, gave to an assistant should be treasured both by parents and teachers. Said he, "You should make an especial point of observing the company they keep; nothing so tells the changes in a boy's character." Recognizing the powerful influences of personal example on the young, "he made it his principal object, first to put a right spirit into the leading boys by attracting their good and noble feelings, and then to make them in-

*Samuel Smiles, Character.

strumental in propagating the same spirit among the rest by the influence of imitation, example and admiration."

The companionship of books is another momentous factor in the formation of character, and the influence of these silent associates is but slightly, if at all, less than that of living companions. There are elements in the environment of every person, over which he has no control, in regard to which he has no choice. He may know them to be injurious and prejudicial to his integrity and advancement, and inimical to the maintenance of good character; but not being able to remove them nor to avoid contact with them, the best he can do is to be on his guard and steel himself against their baneful influence. Thus a person might not be able to remove his dwelling in order to escape bad and offensive neighbors, or to change his occupation for the sake of avoiding foul-mouthed co-workmen and other evil associations. As regards the companionship of literature, books, pictures, and other works of art, whose influence is in direct line with that of books, it is different. We have the advantage of perfect control over the choice of these companions that, in the lives of many of us, exert an enormous influence in the cultivation of mind and the formation of character. Their range, number and extent are limited only by the measure of our ability to procure and purchase. Within the limit of our means we have perfect liberty to choose just such companions as are most congenial, most valuable, and most conducive to our cultivation and general advancement. Through this avenue we have access to the most refined circles, to the companionship of the best and purest and noblest of our race, however crude and inferior the sphere of life in which we are called to live and labor. Whilst in

the course of our daily toils and trials there may be many adverse influences brought to bear on our souls, though there may be countless annoyances, much and hard friction, severe wear and tear of heart and brain, dispiriting, depressing, enervating, we have it within our power, to change our studies — though plain and modest — with an atmosphere that shall be pure, bracing, invigorating, largely counteracting the debilitating effect of daily care, fitting us to bear our burden with greater courage and hopefulness, inspiring us with zeal and perseverance, and impelling us to greater effort and more faithful discharge of duty. It is for this reason and of this advantage that many a worn and weary pastor's study is his most delightful and blessed retreat. It is an oasis in the desert, or like the cool spring and shaded nook along the dusty highway, where the traveler sits down to rest a while and repair his strength and replenish his wasted energies.

"It is unnecessary" (in the words of Samuel Smiles) "to speak of the enormous moral influence which books have exercised upon the general civilization of mankind, from the Bible downward. They contain the treasured knowledge of the human race. They are the record of all labors, achievements, speculations, successes, and failures, in science, philosophy, religion, and morals. They have been the greatest motive-powers in all times." — And of the same kind, though less potential, perhaps, is the motive-power and inspiring influence of eloquent pictures and particularly portraits of the noble and the good. Surely we have all felt within our own hearts the sentiment of that poor German woman, who, pointing to a portrait of the great Reformer hung upon the wall of her humble dwelling, exclaimed, "It does one good to look upon his

manly, honest face." After some acquaintance with Luther's life and works, a glance at his determined, resolute features seems to cause warmer blood to course through our veins and inspire us with more energy and zeal in the maintenance of vim, liberty and the defense and promulgation of sound, scriptural doctrine, — in short, to make better Lutherans of us.

We need not speak of the degrading, corrupting influence of pernicious literature and obscene pictures. The fact that powerful and active societies have been formed for the suppression of these teachers and promoters of wickedness, and that, in spite of the incessant vigilence and unflagging energy of these and other agencies, the flood of vileness continues almost unabated, shows the extent and depth of the evil. Let parents and teachers carefully observe the books and literature which the children read, as well as the companions with whom they associate.

It is interesting to study more particularly the grand and ennobling influence of the Book of books on the individual and national character of the race. But time would fail us in recounting the changes which the Bible has wrought and the triumphs it has won, in ameliorating the condition of the fallen and degraded, restoring them clothed in their right mind, in bringing order out of chaos, in imbuing society with right moral principles, in restoring woman to her rightful place as man's honored companion, in repressing vice and inculcating virtue, in enlightening and civilizing benighted races, and giving constant impulses to advancement and progress, and the nurture and improvement of all that is best and noblest in the human family.

We have thus touched on several important and prin-

cipal factors of a person's environment which enter into the formation of character as moral forces, more or less influential and powerful. We feel that a subject so vast and many-sided cannot be minutely examined or exhaustively presented in a half hour's discourse. Accordingly we have contented ourself with the presentation of several elements as examples, to show what a powerful influence surrounding circumstances exert on the soul in affecting and moulding character.

But we cannot close this discussion without devoting a few moments to the consideration of a question of greatest interest and moment in this connection — the question, namely, as to the limits of the power of environment over character. God has endowed each soul with a will and energy all its own, with a certain self-developing and self-originating power, and this is a force of prime importance and greatest magnitude in the work of character-building. Whatever my other surroundings may be, "I am always," as Emerson says, "environed by myself." However largely it may affect them, no external environment can wholly displace the native qualities of the soul. If the mind is susceptible to impressions from without, if it can be acted on by external objects, it is also conscious of motive power from within, it is capable of reacting on its surroundings. As the character becomes more developed and matured and fixed, its power of discrimination and resistance and reaction becomes greater, unless, indeed, a soul be so unfortunate as to have been emasculated by heredity and training, and become the moral counterpart of the weather-cock.

The sacred Scriptures, together with the facts of biography as well as our own consciousness contradict the theories of fatalists and materialistic evolutionists, who would de-

prive man of all self-determining power of will and make him the pitiful creature of chance and circumstance, "a mere stick on the tide, that goes wherever it is carried, toward vice or virtue." George H. Lewes, an English biographer of Goethe, declares that "it is character which builds an existence out of circumstance. Our strength is measured by our plastic power. From the same materials one man builds palaces, another hovels; one ware-houses, another villas. Bricks and mortar are mortar and bricks, until the architect can make them something else. Thus it is that in the same family, in the same circumstances, one man rears a stately edifice, while his brother, vacillating and incompetent, lives forever amid ruins; the block of granite which was an obstacle on the pathway of the weak, becomes a stepping-stone on the pathway of the strong."

The same difference is evident in the history of nations. In times of the greatest moral and intellectual dearth and sterility, out of the bosom of races the most degraded, licentious and worthless, whose condition might be well represented by the declaration of the prophet, "the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint," have arisen men of powerful intellect and stern morality and noble qualities of soul, men who have, in head and heart, towered majestically above their fellows, and the chastening and transforming touch of whose personal vigor and purity was felt in every part of the body politic and for generations following. Thus, to point out but one striking example, distinguished in their prophetic force of penetration and marvelous powers of endurance, rose up the great hero martyrs of Italy, while corruption and frivolity held sway in high places and low, among the bearers of political and ecclesiastical titles and insignia of power and rank, no less than

among the ignorant slaves and outcasts of society. While Italy was going headlong in its mad career of luxury, frivolity, dissipation and vice, in the twelfth century came Arnold of Brescia, the impassioned and eloquent preacher of purity, love and righteousness, and into the prison-houses of his countrymen he sounded the trumpet of Italian liberty, civil and religious, personal and social. In the thirteenth century appeared Dante, his soul, in glaring contrast with the faint and famishing heart of his time, glowing with love and truth, and in unequalled song this lover of justice and liberty made "the mad Italian world to tremble in the light of time, between heaven above and hell beneath." And about a century later, while Italy was still abandoned to its passions and corruptions, another herald of truth and liberty appeared on that checkered stage,—Savonarola, one of the "jewels of history," a man who, with all his eccentricities and minor blemishes of character, stands forth for all time a brilliant example of noble purpose and intrepid daring and manly endurance to the end, and whole-souled consecration and unflinching adherence to his sense and course of duty and right. One utterance of his characterizes the man and the hour. "Do you ask me in general what will be the end of the conflict? I answer, Victory. But if you ask me in particular, I answer, Death." He dared to wage war upon all Italy, directed his piercing shafts at crowned and uncrowned heads alike, with the same fearlessness, frankness and force, and after prolonged torture and untold agonies, nobly and victoriously did he die on the scaffold, saying, "The Lord has suffered as much for me," while the people, who had before hung upon his eloquent lips, now become a fickle mob, were screaming for his death. His death was victory, be-

cause, unswayed by considerations of personal safety, he dared to die in the cause of truth, and because, on the dark back-ground of his nation's life he left the indelible impress of his pure and exalted character.

Contrast for a moment the characters of Erasmus and Luther, co-temporaries, both men of vast abilities, powerful intellect and great literary attainments, acting on and reacted upon by the same age and the same general conditions. Yet in all the qualities that constitute a good and great character, what a contrast! Both stand before the world and may be known not only by their whole life and life-work, but, summarily, by their pertinent and undying utterances. The weak Erasmus is reflected in his epigrammatic declaration, "I will not be unfaithful to the cause of Christ,—at least as far as the age will permit me." The mighty Luther, in defiance of the age, in utter indifference to public sentiment and popular opinion, in profound contempt of consequences to himself,—in the face of potentates and powers and principalities, declares, "*I will not recant* . . . GOD HELP ME!"

As in the Church, so in the State, the race of satellites and moral pigmies has been numerous,—men who, for the sake of popularity, will reflect the wishes and tastes and opinions of those whose favor they would win and whose ill-will they would at every cost avoid. But there have been those also who, like Wellington and our own Washington, had an abiding sence of duty, and willingly paid the penalty of their adherence to the course they deemed right, in their loss of popularity. And so in humbler spheres of action there have always been men who could not be bought, men whom no force or combination of circumstances could sway from the path of rectitude and duty.

Undoubtedly the influence of environment over character is most powerful during the period of growth. The bias given to a person's moral character in early life is of immense importance. It may not be "possible to rear a kindly nature, sensitive to evil, pure in mind and heart, amidst coarseness, discomfort and impurity." But history shows that it *is* possible to maintain good character and be a Christian in the most unfavorable environment, if one cannot escape from it. And the fact is that, "to be worth anything, character must be capable of standing firm upon its feet in a world of daily work, temptation and trial, and able to bear the wear and tear of actual life."*

In conclusion I need but refer to the fact that the secret of forming and maintaining a truly good and abidingly pure character in any environment, under any and all circumstances whatever, is found not in the wit and wisdom and energy of man, but in the soul-renewing, regenerating and sanctifying power of the Spirit of God. It is the power of Him who rules in the heavens, and by His grace and providence in the hearts and lives of men, that lifts Christian character above all circumstances and gives it an unfading lustre and enduring worth. The highest type of character is that which approaches most nearly to the character of Him "who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption." And the only way to attain and retain such a Christ-like character is by spiritual association and communion with Christ, by devoutly studying His Gospel and receiving His words, which are spirit and life, and thus following Him and learning of Him who in the Gospel comes to us as "meek and lowly in heart," whilst He is at the same time Lord of

* Smiles, Character.

heaven and earth. Let it be our care to charge our environments with this power of God by hearing and doing and disseminating the Word of the cross which liveth and abideth forever.

"WHAT THE ROMAN CATHOLICS WANT."

On this subject Monsignor T. S. Preston published an article in *The Forum* for April, 1886; and as he argues with considerable skill and earnestness, and evidently supposes that the position which he has undertaken to defend is throughout unassailable, we deem it worth our while to try to make it plain that he is mistaken after all, and that his argument really proves too much, which is the same as proving nothing, so far as the tenableness of his views is concerned. In order to give a fair presentation of his position, we shall take up his article point by point, although we will thus have to consider some statements with which we agree; for not all that Mr. Preston has to say is false.

The article alluded to begins with these words: "Catholics only desire to enjoy their religion, and to practice it with the full freedom which the Constitution of the United States guarantees to them; and we may add that they do not desire to interfere with the rights of those who are not Catholics. We desire that all non-Catholics, whatever may be their creed, should enjoy the perfect freedom which we claim for ourselves."

We wish we could believe that what the Romish writer here says in regard to the attitude of his Church with reference to "those who are not Catholics," were true. We admit and always have admitted that the Roman Catholics

should have full freedom to enjoy their religion, unless their religion should interfere with the rights of others. According to what Mr. Preston says, they do not desire so to interfere; on the contrary, they desire that all non-Catholics should enjoy the perfect freedom which they claim for themselves. So Mr. Preston says. But does his church say the same thing? It certainly did not say anything like the same thing when it caused Huss and Savonarola to be put to death on account of their faith. It said nothing of the kind in the days of the Reformation when it exerted all its powers to silence Luther and his co-laborers. Surely, too, the Inquisition has quite a different desire to express. The Inquisition, in fact, was invented for the very purpose of suppressing, by force, all those who did not confess the Romish religion, and in the days of its power it would have considered such an expression as the one we have quoted from Mr. Preston's article as worthy of the severest punishment. And when did the Romish Church ever endorse any such a statement? When did it condemn or repudiate the persecution of so-called heretics, of which it was guilty in the past? What assurance has it ever given that its spirit has changed? Does not its claim of infallibility make it necessary for it to endorse its past acts, which were approved by councils and popes, as being altogether right and proper? Unless the Romish Church repudiates her past deeds of violence and confesses to the world, through her own properly constituted authorities, that she did wrong in putting so-called heretics to death, and that she really desires all to enjoy the same liberty which she claims for herself, we shall feel bound to distrust all such assurances of Romish writers, like that of Mr. Preston, however sincere the writers themselves may be in making them. Official

acts need official disapproval, in order to convince us that they are no longer approved; and in a matter involving so complete a danger of front as is embraced in the desire expressed by Mr. Preston, we must have something more than mere private statements, before we can deem them worthy of our confidence.

Mr. Preston goes on to say: "With us Catholics the question of education is a part of our religious duty. Our faith commands us to instruct our children in accordance with the principles of our creed. We are bound in conscience to do so; and if we are restrained from doing so, we possess not the freedom to practice our religion. If there were a law forbidding us to do so, we could not obey that law, since our consciences would demand that 'we should obey God rather than man.' To make plain our views and principles on the subject of education we will state briefly the following propositions:

'1. The responsibility of educating children falls upon the parents, whom God has made their natural guardians. They cannot evade this responsibility. They will have to answer to God for the souls of their children; and neglect of the duty they owe to them will be a serious crime.'"

We have no fault to find with what is here said. We do not blame the Romanists for deeming it their duty to educate their children; nor do we wish to see the government lay a straw in their way in their endeavor to carry on their educational work. We, too, as Lutherans, are bound in conscience "to instruct our children in accordance with the principles of our creed." We, too, would feel in conscience bound to disobey any law which would forbid us to give our children a Christian education; for "we ought to obey God rather than men." Thanks be to God, however,

there is no law forbidding us to train up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The Constitution and laws of our country leave us free to obey the Savior's words: "Feed my lambs."

2. "We hold also," Mr. Preston goes on to say, "that religion cannot be divorced from education. In this we have at least the theoretical support of many non-Catholics. In the instruction of children we believe that it is our duty to teach them the truths of our faith while we open their minds to the light of natural science."

Again we have no fault to find with the words of the Romish writer. We agree that religion cannot be divorced from true education. In this, no doubt, all Christians are agreed. Of course, when we speak of religion we mean the Christian religion or true Christianity. Doubtless Mr. Preston means Roman Catholicism when he speaks of "the truths of our (his) faith;" and we again do not blame him for thinking it to be the duty of Roman Catholics to teach their children the Roman Catholic religion. Of course, we deem it to be our duty to teach our children the truths of Christianity as confessed by our Church. We do not want them to be taught Romish tenets, just as Mr. Preston does not want the children of Romish parents to be taught the tenets of the Lutheran Church. Nevertheless the principle is correct that true education and religion must go together; and therefore we say that the Church should educate her own children.

3. Nor have we any objections to offer in reference to Mr. Preston's third proposition. "We believe also that morality, in the common acceptation of the term, is so bound up with religion that no moral principles can be taught without it." Such morality as we want can spring

from Christianity only; and in order that our children may be governed by the principles of the Christian religion, they must be taught to know and respect and adhere to those principles, which can be done only by means of a Christian training.

4. On the principle that it is right to be taught by our enemies let us hear what this Romish writer has to say on the necessity of establishing congregational schools.

"It being then our duty, from the teaching of our faith, to unite religious training with the education of the young, the question arises as to the mode of accomplishing this end. How shall it be done? If we lived in a country where all agreed in the confession of one faith there would be no difficulty. The tenets of one common creed could be easily taught with every step taken in imparting human knowledge. No one could be offended, and, indeed, the wishes of all would be gratified. But when our society is made up of many religious persuasions, all teaching different and contradictory beliefs, and of many who have no faith at all, and who vindicate to themselves the right to have none, the question is not so easily answered. There are Catholics, Protestants, with many widely differing creeds, Jews with the traditions of their ancient faith, unbelievers of various ranks with discordant views of God, and atheists who assert that the idea of a God is an absurdity to reason and an infringement upon human liberty. Will it be right to give up everything to this latter class, and because those who call themselves Christians cannot agree, to surrender our children to the atheist who believes in nothing? By this plan the class which has the least to believe, and therefore the least right to teach anything, takes possession of the whole commonwealth and begins to form society at its will.

We have been much surprised to see good Protestants willing to surrender all they professed to hold dear to that class of society which has no belief, and therefore the least right to impose its preferences upon the public. Still if they can conscientiously do this, it is certain that we cannot.

"Nor can it be said that the defects of such a system of education, from which all religious belief is excluded, can be supplied in other ways. There are no ways by which this radical defect can be made up. The Sunday-school is utterly impotent to teach the young mind the truth which has been practically ignored, if not contradicted all the week. Experience proves this to every one who has ever made any attempt in the instruction of children. One hour a week cannot be set against thirty with all the impressions and associations which the day-school brings. The mind, as it expands from day to day in the knowledge of truth, must also see in every line the growing light of the Creator and the lessons of His divine revelation; otherwise each step will be an advance on the path of negation, which, though called the path of philosophy by many, is really the way of infidelity. Children are to be taught positively the dogmas of faith revealed. Those dogmas are not to be either put aside or doubtfully referred to, as if they were only questions to be examined.

"And, in fact, there is no place where children can be addressed but the daily school. There is no other place where the lessons of religion or the teachings of the Church can reach them. We believe there is no just way of denying this fact. At any rate it is the conscientious conviction of Catholics, founded upon their knowledge and experience. If, therefore, the elimination of all religious teaching from the school satisfies no one, or should satisfy no one but

atheists, there is only one portion of society which can be pleased with what we may call godless schools.

"The system which would select out of the articles of the Christian creed, or seek to teach a few of the truths of natural religion, is a practical impossibility. There are no truths upon which all classes are ever agreed. Unhappily there is not one which is not denied by many. And where is the arbiter who has the right to decide upon the truths which shall be deemed essential? If Protestants, inconsistently as it seems to us with their professions, are willing to adopt such a system, we Catholics surely are not, and our rights of conscience are to be respected.

"There remains then only one way by which the principles we hold sacred can be subserved, and the freedom to practice our religion be granted to us. This is the establishment of denominational schools, in which from early childhood the truths of revelation and of the Divine law may be impressed upon the growing powers of the young mind. These powers will grow for good or for evil, for truth or for error. In this way every religious denomination would be able to provide for its own children, and to preserve what it professes to hold dear. And we will say that every denomination must do this, or be instrumental in its own destruction by the neglect of the most ordinary means of self-preservation."

We see from this that the Romanists know what they want and why they want it. They are wise in this generation in thus perceiving what is necessary for their growth and prosperity. The future of their Church — the future of every church, in fact — is dependent upon the training of its children; and the way to secure the proper training of the children is found in the establishment of parochial

schools. Of this fact our Church is not ignorant; but it must be confessed that the Romanists, for the most part, manifest much more zeal than do we in the founding of such schools, and that in this respect they are really in a position to teach us a wholesome lesson.

We come now to a part of Mr. Preston's article which contains the very marrow of "what the Roman Catholics want." It is well known that the Romanists have never been hindered in the least in the establishment of schools according to their liking. But they want something more than the mere freedom to have their own schools.

"We are told that, granting all this, 'we have our liberty; we may establish as many Christian schools as we choose. There is no one to hinder us.' To this we reply that we recognize our loyal right, and that we make use of it. But there is an injustice practiced upon us which is a species of persecution. It is strange that candid minds fail to see it at once. The State imposes a large tax upon all its citizens for the support of its schools. These schools are not according to our conscience. We ought not to be forced to patronize them. If we cannot use them with a good conscience, ought we to be forced to pay for them? Is it just to tax us for them when we cannot send our children to them, and when we are obliged to pay heavy sums for the building and maintaining of parochial schools. It is amazing to us that honest people do not see the injustice of this. There are those who know well that the public schools are the principal cause of the perversion of many of our children from the faith of their fathers.

"Because they are glad to see this result, are fair-minded citizens willing to be so unjust to us, and to do to others what they would not tolerate for themselves?"

(*Concluded in next number.*)

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are $2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. C. H. L. Schuette, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. V.

		PAGE.
1.	WHAT THE ROMAN CATHOLICS WANT, by Prof. A. Pflueger.....	257
2.	THE CONSTITUTION OF SYNODS, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	267
3.	CHRISTMAS AND EASTER SCENES IN JERUSALEM, Translated by Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D	291
4.	THE AGE OF MAN GEOLOGICALLY CONSIDERED, by S. R. Pattison, Esq., F. G. S.....	309

Monies Received for Volume VI.

Rev. C. Spielmann, Rev. A. W. Werder, J. J. Dobler, Rev. G. A. Harter, Rev. C. H. Althoff, Rev. J. M. Koepplin, Rev. P. G. Doepke, Rev. W. J. Schroyer, each $2.00, Rev. F. Volz $5.00, Rev. L. F. Mink $4.00, R. Lenski $1.00.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. VI.—No. V.

OCTOBER, 1886.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1886.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VI. OCTOBER, 1886. No. 5.

WHAT ROMAN CATHOLICS WANT.

CONCLUDED.

Although we think we are honest and fair-minded citizens, we fail to see that any injustice is done to the Romanists when they are taxed with others for the support of the public schools.

The State has seen fit to establish schools for the purpose of preparing the children of its citizens for the duties of citizenship. This the State has a perfect right to do, and no church or sect has a right to interfere. Moreover, as long as perfect liberty is given to any denomination to have its own schools, no church has a right to complain. There are a great many citizens who do not belong to any church, and who would seriously object to having their children taught in denominational schools. No doubt, many such citizens would let their children grow up in utter ignorance, if the State had made no provision for them. Such ignorance would be a constant menace to the State and to all good citizens. Anarchists and communists find among the ignorant their willing dupes and the material for their blind and ferocious mobs by which the property and the lives of the best citizens are put in jeopardy. It is as much to the

interest of Romanists as of Protestants and others to have illiteracy eliminated as much as possible from the body politic. Whatever benefit the State aims to derive from the public schools in the way of training its children for the duties of citizenship, is enjoyed in common by all the citizens of the State, the Romanists included with the rest. Hence as the benefit is really enjoyed by all, the expense incurred in securing it should be borne by all. This is certainly both just and fair. The State does not and should not aim to furnish the religious training which we deem necessary for our children or which the Romanists deem necessary for theirs. If this does not suit us, as, in fact, it does not, we have the remedy in our own hands: we can establish schools in which the religious wants of our children will be met. But since we cannot give our children the requisite religious instruction without giving them at the same time the necessary secular instruction, we must give them both, and be willing to pay the entire expense.

"But," says Mr. Preston, "the public schools are godless. We say this with no intention of speaking ill of them, nor of ignoring their real merits. All their merits we appreciate. But they are, and must be godless, as neither the existence of God nor His revelation to man can be taught in them. They have only one end in view, and can have no other. This is the direction of the mind and all the impulses of the heart to the needs of time at the expense of eternity. The materialism of our day ignores altogether the life after death with its great and endless destinies. When we are taxed to support such schools we are forced to contribute to that which according to our conscience is wrong in principle and evil in

its results to children and to society. Is this just? Is it in accordance with the fair principles which should govern a State like ours? If it be admitted that the State shall assume the expense of primary education, we ought either to be exempted from the tax imposed or receive a proportion of the sum raised according to the number of the children we educate. Can anything be more reasonable? The same privilege would apply to all private schools, which would in strict justice share in the tax paid by all. This is what Catholics want."

The plan here proposed involves the overthrow of the principle embodied in the Constitution of the United States, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Accordingly the State and the Church are and must remain separate. The State is not to concern itself about the affairs of the various denominations any further than to secure to them the protection which may be necessary for the enjoyment of the freedom granted by the Constitution. Beyond this the State ought not to go. Of course, we admit that this principle does not agree with the spirit of Popery; for Popery has always claimed that the State should not be separate from the Church, but under the control of the Church, as the pages of history abundantly testify. If, however, Popery finds itself in conflict with the Constitution of our country, must our Constitution on that account be changed or violated? We think not. If the Romanists object to the principles underlying our government, they should all the more on that account let it alone, and not belabor it with demands which those principles forbid it to grant. In view of the spirit and the history of their Church, both of

which deliver their testimony in favor of the utter subjection of the State to the will of the Pope, and implicitly and explicitly teach that no government in reality has any right to the freedom which ours enjoys, such men as Preston should scorn to ask any favors from the State, but quietly submit to the taxes which are imposed upon them in common with all others to maintain the institutions which our government has established. Let them know once for all that we want no union of Church and State in this country, and that the religious liberty, which all enjoy under our Constitution, is the greatest blessing which we have inherited from its framers.

Consistently carried out, the principle underlying Mr. Preston's plan would exempt all members of the Church from supporting all institutions which they do not use. He urges the claim that Romanists should not be forced to pay tax for the support of the public schools, because their *conscience* will not permit them to send their children to such schools for an education. But is the government on that account justified in exempting them from paying tax for its schools, or in giving them their proportion of the school tax? If so, where would it be justified in drawing the line? Would it not then be obliged to adopt the same plan with reference to orphans' homes and infirmaries? The conscience of the Church should be wide awake as to prompt her to take care of her orphans and her poor, and to consider it a disgrace to have them cared for by the State. It should be a matter of conscience with every Christian not to use for the support of his poor brethren and their orphans the institutions which the State has established; first, because it is the duty of the Church to attend to the wants of her

people when they are in need of help, and secondly, because their spiritual wants are not properly cared for in state institutions of charity. But should we therefore consider it unjust and unfair to be taxed to support the orphans' homes, the alms-houses and the infirmaries of the government? By no means; for since we constitute a part of the State, its institutions are ours, and as such we are in duty bound to support them, although our conscience may forbid us to use them for ourselves and our brethren. Do the Romanists think that they owe nothing to those who do not belong to their fold? It would seem so from the way they argue. But if so, they are mistaken. If they enjoy, as they certainly do, the benefits of the government and of its institutions, whether directly or indirectly, they are morally bound to do their share in bearing the burden in carrying on the affairs of the government.

Furthermore, the State dare not listen to such claims on the part of any religious denomination, so far as the payment of tax in support of its institutions is concerned. If the mere claim that our conscience will not permit us to use certain things which the State affords would exempt us from taxation in support of them, all any one would need to do, in order to free himself from a tax which he considers burdensome, would be to set up that claim, and his end would be accomplished. As we hinted above, the State is not to concern itself about the religion of its citizens. It is not to inquire as to whether they belong to any church or not. It is to make no difference in its dealings with its citizens on account of their faith or their want of faith. It must, in short, treat all alike.

Nor should the fact that the Romanists do not use

the public schools induce the State to adopt the plan which Mr. Preston proposes. It is not the fault of the State that they do not use its schools. If the principle were to prevail, that those who do not use certain privileges should be exempt from the taxation which is necessary to enable the State to afford them, then taxation could not be equal, and the body politic could not fail to suffer serious injury.

Let the Romanists say what they may, their schools are in the interest of their own sect; and therefore they should be perfectly willing to support them at their own expense. To ask the government for a portion of the school tax or for exemption from paying such tax, is to ask it to become the propagator of a sect — a sect, too, which, judging from its past history, would sooner or later, if it obtained the necessary power, dig the grave of our liberties.

What a complicated affair it would be, too, for the State to find out just how much tax to apportion to each denomination, in case Mr. Preston's plan were adopted! What endless wrangling and disputing would ensue! Moreover, in many places the Romanists would obtain a great deal more money from the public treasury than they would pay in in the way of tax. According to Mr. Preston they should "receive a proportion of the sum raised according to the number of the children they educate." It is well known that the laity in the Romish Church are usually poor and are blessed with a goodly number of children. Now the poor pay but little tax at best, and very often they pay no tax at all; but they furnish the children to be educated. Now in drawing tax out of the treasury those children must all be counted, but in paying

tax into the treasury many of them need not be counted at all, seeing that their parents are too poor to be taxed. Hence others besides the Roman Catholics would in reality be taxed to support Roman Catholic schools. For ourselves, we would rather pay ten dollars in support of the public schools than one cent in support of Romish schools. We are well aware that the Romish Church as such is not poor, but the great bulk of its property is in such a shape as to be beyond the reach of the assessor. All things considered, therefore, the Romanists would be able, under the proposed plan, to conduct their parochial schools at other peoples' expense.

Mr. Preston, however, thinks that education would thus be made much cheaper than it is under the public school system. "Again," to quote his own words, "if the State pay for primary education, which seems to be the plan generally deemed wise and salutary, the expense would be much reduced by the denominational system. As far as we can estimate by the experience of our Catholic schools, it would be at most one-half of what it is now. Is this not some advantage, when at the same time there would be much greater peace and happiness? Statesmen are constantly seeking for economy in the administration of public affairs. Why not apply this economy to the schools, if the interests of education do not suffer thereby?

"Catholics have found that we can maintain charitable and all other institutions at a much less expense than can the State. Why not let the gentle hand of religion, guided by the love of God, do its part in the commonwealth, and save vast outlays from the State treasury. Surely there is no just reason which can move any fair mind to draw from the public great sums which are not necessary. Every

school which we establish, every charitable institution which we found, saves the State much more than people generally realize."

But what would become of all this talk about the cheapness of education under the denominational system, if Mr. Preston's plan were fairly and justly carried out? He seems to be thinking only of the Romanists as drawing their proportion from the public funds. But suppose we look a little further. Suppose all the denominations should come and demand their share of the sums raised by taxation for school purposes. Suppose that every sect would want to build its school houses at convenient distances and to employ good teachers in each of them, would not in that event the school houses and school teachers be almost as

> "Thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks
> In Vallombrosa?"

We will not undertake to dispute Mr. Preston's figures so far as the Romish Church and its schools are concerned; but who dees not see that his plan, if fairly carried out, would make education much more expensive to the State than it is at present? We doubt, too, whether he would be any better satisfied with Protestant parochial schools than he is with the public schools.

In reply to the question, "Why not let the gentle hand of religion, guided by the love of God, do its part in the commonwealth, and save vast outlays from the State Treasury?" we would merely ask another: Who has been hindering the gentle hand of religion from doing all this? Who has ever said you may when you wanted to establish a parochial school, or an orphans' home, or a hospital, or any other institution that you deemed necessary or desir-

able? Since every one knows that "the gentle hand of religion" has been perfectly free to do what it pleased in this direction, we presume that Mr. Preston really meant to put his question in this form: "Why not give the Roman Catholics as much money from the public exchequer as they may need to establish and maintain their parochial schools, orphan asylums, and other institutions?" From such an outrageous abuse of the public funds may the Lord deliver our beloved country.

"Finally," says Mr. Preston, "the great and inestimable advantage of a truly religious education would flow from the system we recommend as the only just one." Again we fear that he is thinking only of the Romish Church. Or would he really regard it a "great and inestimable advantage" to have Lutheran parochial schools, for example, established and supported by the State? If so, he is occupying a very lonesome position as a Roman Catholic, to judge from the anathemas which his church hurled at ours in the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. As a specimen of the treatment our doctrines receive in the said Canons and Decrees we here give *Canon XXX, under Justification:* "If any one saith, that, after the grace of Justification has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt is remitted, and the debt of eternal punishment is blotted out in such wise that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment to be discharged either in this world, or in the next in Purgatory, before the entrance to the kingdom of heaven can be opened (to him): let him be anathema."

Whatever Mr. Preston may think of us, we know that his sect has no love, but intense hatred instead, for the teachings and the prominent teachers of our communion.

The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent have never been revoked. They still stand as a part of the Confession of the Romish Church. They therefore are confessedly the standard by which its animus toward us and others is to be recognized and judged.

Mr. Preston evidently thinks that the State would be doing itself a great favor, if it would consent to the adoption of his plan; but we are persuaded that it would really be standing in its own light and helping to sow the seeds of its own destruction. The growth of Romanism has not been a blessing to the State in the past; and we have no reason whatever to believe that it will prove to be such in the future. On the contrary, we believe with Luther that the Pope is the Antichrist, spoken of by St. Paul as "the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God . . . whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming; even him whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." Popery, therefore, as such, is evil, and only evil, and that continually.

In the face of all the protests of Romanists with reference to the revenues of the State and in opposition to all their attempts to devote those revenues to their own private ends, we must constantly point to the words of our Savior in reply to the Jesuits of His day: "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." P.

THE CONSTITUTION OF SYNODS.

In extreme antithesis to liberalism which indulges an undue latitude in the interpretation and use of God's Word, there exists also a certain literalism which is squeamishly nice and anxious in its adherence to the letter of the sacred Scriptures. Among the people of the latter school there are those, for example, who hold the use of an organ in church to be a sin for the simple reason that, there being no divine command, they hold that there is no Scripture warrant for music of that kind in the sanctuary. So hymns, inasmuch as they are not God's own composition, can find no place in His service as conducted by these people. How, in consistency with such a principle, music of any kind can be put to use in the order of worship, it is hard to tell, seeing that there are no such things as melodies by inspiration. Comparatively harmless as such notions are so long as they are confined to matters of this kind, they do all the more mischief when extended to other and more important affairs of the Church. If in the general work of the Church a man will employ no methods, use no forms, avail himself of no agencies and follow no ways, except such only as are hallowed by Scriptural examples or established by divine precept, he will prove himself a sorry workman indeed.

Beyond this, that everything be done decently and in order, that Christians covet earnestly the best gifts and that they follow after wisdom in all things, the Lord has laid no command on His Church concerning the particular manner in which she may best prosecute the work of her mission. His charge to His people that they keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, implies the relative necessity as

well as the entire naturalness of a union among them of some sort; but how this union is to be constituted, He has not stated, neither has He commanded that it shall be. That the work which He has placed into so many hands may at all prosper, some system of operation is necessary; but what that system is to be, is not specified. In the holy fight that is to be fought He, as the great Captain of salvation, retains the full command and requires a rigid obedience to all His orders; but these do not extend to the particular tactics to be observed in the shift of battle. Being the true God and Life eternal, and therefore the infinite source of all the light and grace and beauty of holiness, He desires to be worshiped in Spirit and in truth; but He has prescribed no order according to which the worshiping multitude are to come into His presence.

From these and from observations of a similar nature, it is evident that, the work being assigned, the means provided, the end specified and the fundamental principles of action given, the Lord's people have left to them many things which they themselves are to determine and arrange as best they can in the wisdom bestowed on them and with the gifts they have received.

Now it is from such a source as this, and within the sphere of liberty to act as here pointed out, that Christian synods have their origin. It must be admitted on all sides that God has nowhere commanded the establishment of synods, and that He has not in so many words made it the irremissible duty of Christians to connect with them. Inasmuch as an institution in order to be divine must be based on a Word of God expressly establishing it, Christian synods cannot with propriety be called divine institutions. Men having devised them they are, in view of this fact,

human contrivances; and as such they must be denominated in order to distinguish them from such institutions as God Himself has ordained. And yet, while the intelligent Christian cannot consent to have them called divine, he feels at the same time that to have them spoken of as human institutions does not satisfy him. To do full justice to the subject, he finds the one predicate too strong and the other too weak. He therefore speaks of them as churchly institutions—as institutions which, while they are something less than divine, are yet something more than human. Now in order to determine the nature and extent of the jurisdiction which may properly and advantageously be given to synods, it is above all necessary to understand the true meaning and full force of the term "churchly" as applied to such bodies.

The Church, being the congregation of Christian believers, is indeed a congregation of men, but of men who are illumined of God and led by His Spirit. Distinct from the general mass of mankind they are, as God Himself declares, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that should shew forth the praises of Him who has called them out of darkness into His marvelous light. When now a people thus sanctified and so highly exalted come together in the name of their God and constrained by His Spirit in order to plead His grace for themselves and for others and so to show forth His praise, then have we before us an assembly of men that is more than human; and when these people in this same Spirit and for these same purposes organize, then have we a body of men that is more than a mere human organization. It lacks all but one element of being divine in the strict sense of the term: this, namely, that as a particular form or order of

organization God has not expressly commanded it. The Spirit in which a Christian synod is presumably established is the Spirit of Christ, and the work for which it legitimately and professedly exists, is a work which He Himself has given His people to do; these, then, and other things which enter in some way into the compossition and activity of the body, are divine. But because Christ has not by word of command ordered His work to be done by way of synodical operation Christians, to keep within the bounds of exact truth and not to bind on the consciences of men anything human, are careful not to call their synodical organizations divine ordinances. Considered merely as a form and order of Christian activity, they are the devices and arrangements of the Church; however, on account of the divine substance with which they have to do and of the holy interests bound up with them, they are withal a form and order of life to be accounted of as most sacred. They are the inventions of churchly wisdom, and this is not inspired; and yet, the Church is taught of God. Moreover, it is her life which seeks to diffuse itself over the earth by way of these establishments; and that life is of God. It is her work which they are intended to accomplish; but that work is none other than the Lord's own work. By a churchly as distinguished from a strictly divine organization, therefore, is meant a union of believers which, while it is not ordained of God, is nevertheless the result of divine operations in the hearts of God's people; and a union, which has for its object in full accord with the Word of God to further the work of His kingdom.

Their holy origin, their sacred character and their high and noble purpose, as thus set forth, speak strongly in favor of Christian synods; but the strongest of all ar-

guments that can be urged in their behalf is what has been called their moral necessity. It is next to impossible for both the individual Christian and the Christian congregation to do the Lord's work thoroughly except by way of uniting their efforts with those of the many. The work assigned to all believers alike is to have the Gospel brought to all people. One and all are to do all they can toward the accomplishment of this their common mission. Whatever aid a Christian can lend toward it is to be made as efficient as possible; and to be faithful, he must see to it that this be done. This is true alike of the individual believer and of the congregation. Now wherever these isolate themselves from their kind and fail to co-operate with them, they will find themselves unable to do anything whatever in some of the departments of Christian activity. Never can the mite of the poor by itself and alone educate and support a pastor, or send out a missionary, or establish a school, or publish a good Christian book or paper: but all these things can be done, and be done only, when to the pennies and prayers of the one the pennies and prayers of the many are added. Hence, in order to have the Gospel preached to all men, the Lord's people are constrained to co-operate; and where there must be co-operation there should be also, nay, there must be a body corporate of some kind in order to effect, to regulate and to superintend it. As the workmen of Christ are to covet the best gifts, so should they also covet the best ways of applying them to profit withal; and thus far the corporate, that is, the synodical way has commended itself to the Church as the very best if not as the only way. There may be, (yes, as doubtlessly there are in the ratio of one to a thousand, say) single persons, and families and congregations here and there which, besides having the spiritual wants of

themselves and their neighborhood attended to, are in a condition to do something without the assistance of others for the souls of men abroad and thus for the Church generally. But even these exceptional cases are bound for a two-fold reason to unite their efforts with such of their fellow Christians as are not so favorably situated. For not only will their own work be thereby rendered all the more effective, but by so doing they will strengthen the hearts and hands of others having the same high calling with themselves. Here, as much as anywhere else, the strong are to support the weak. Moreover, it will be found that there are few so weak but what they can add something to push forward the common work. In short, if all the workmen—the rich as well as the poor, the wise as well as the foolish, the strong as well as the weak, and this applied to congregations no less than to individuals—can derive some benefit from uniting and laboring together, it becomrs their bounden duty to do so as the opportunity for it is given them. Look at it as one may, Christian synods are a moral necessity.

Whether or not synods err at times and do wrong, and thereby may forfeit the respect and support otherwise due to them, that is not the question here where the principles underlying them and where their ideal charactor and real purpose are under discussion. How then, in view of what may be said of them in this respect, any Christian or Christian congregation can doubt the legitimacy of such bodies, or question their usefulness, treat them with indifference, refuse to have any connection with them, or even do what they can to disparage their very existence, it is difficult to understand. Examined in the light of God's Word, the principle of synodical union and co-operation is found to

be no less lawful than its application is natural, necessary and beneficial. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." 1 Cor. 1, 10. Comp. Eph. 4, 3–6. But the outward union, if at all real, is the natural expression of the inward unity; and hence, where this is enjoined the other cannot be forbidden. Again: "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." 1 Cor. 12, 4, etc. Wherefore, since on different men different gifts are bestowed and since the one is to profit the other with the gifts received, it must be in full accord with Scripture to create such unions as are intended to render all the more effective the practice of this reciprocity of rights and duties.

The expediency if not the necessity of doing this very thing made itself felt already in the earliest days of the Christian Church, so that in consequence of it the Scriptures themselves furnish a precedent for church-assemblies of a more general character than that given in the local congregation. See Acts 15. The difference between the assembly of that time and the synods of our own is one more of form than of substance: the body then and there convened being transitory while at present they have a permanently established character. And since the Holy Ghost by His presence and favor approved of the body convened at Jerusalem, what reasonable doubt can there be about His approbation of such bodies now? Scruples as to

the entire Scripturalness of synods, if at all sincere, can only be ascribed to that morbid literalism which was noticed in the beginning of this article; and if not, then are they the hollow pretensions either of some unconscionable stickler or of some disaffected person who lacks the courage to make an honest defence of his grievances.

Fortunately, objections of this kind put, as they are, on the flimsy ground that synods are not in accord with Scripture precept or example, are seldom raised; and in the Church of the Reformation, never, unless it be in a few exceptional cases. But here as elsewhere, though for other reasons, the supreme usefulness of synods is not always recognized as it should be; nor are these bodies themselves held in that high esteem to which, in view of the sanctity of their character and of the laudableness of their purpose, they are entitled. Aside from the fact that this is in part due to a lack of interest in church affairs generally, there are doubtlessly other errors and evils at the bottom of it: some, it may be, in the organizations themselves; and others in the persons who fail to treat them aright. On the one hand it will be found that synods are in their very principles not always constituted as they should be; and then, that in their practices they at times make serious mistakes and hence give grievous offence. On the other hand—and this is perhaps the more frequent trouble—it will be found that not seldom the Christian's individual liberty is falsely urged, nay, that a false personal independency is maintained in opposition to synods; or again, that an ultra congregationalism is indulged greatly to the detriment of the Church at large and of its work. On no ground whatever can such a clashing of personal and of corporate rights be justified; for there need be no antagonism be-

tween them, inasmuch as both are founded on the same truth and to be governed by it. In principle the interests of true Christian liberty, of personal independency, and of congregational rights on the one hand and those of synods on the other, do not interfere; and there is no need of them doing so in practice. Viewed in their true nature and with respect to their proper exercise, these several rights are not against but for each other. About this there can be no doubt. The question is, how, in their application to life, these different interests can best be secured and promoted in full and equal justice to all the parties concerned in them. More particularly: how should a Christian synod be constituted, what should be the nature and extent of its jurisdiction, in order that the body itself may be made most efficient to accomplish the purpose of its existence, and at the same time that there be no undue interference with any of the rights and liberties of those who compose its membership? This is of all synodical problems, if not the most important one, yet the most difficult of solution. The least light on the subject, it is supposed here, must ever be welcome.

In the first place: that a body intended to do the general work of the Church should be made up of those to whom that work primarily belongs, is a truism so simply natural and just that it may seem ridiculous to call attention to it. Nevertheless there have been, and there are, those who deny it. Not to mention the papists, there are protestants who hold that the affairs of the Church should be put into the hands of the clergy: some maintaining that such is the will and order of God; others, that it is most proper and expedient so to do. The former notion is a lie, the latter a mistake. Of course, there can be no objection to a body of

clergy as long as it confines itself to its own business; but just as soon as it assumes authority and undertakes work which do not belong to it, either by divine or human right as the case may require, that soon such a body becomes an evil not to be tolerated. If the propagation of the Gospel to the extension of God's kingdom is a privilege belonging exclusively to the clergy, then as a matter of course may they organize among themselves to the exclusion of the laity in order thoroughly to do their duty. The work then were theirs, and theirs the worry and expense of it together with all the responsibility. But such is not the case: it belongs to the whole Church, that is, to all Christians taken individually and collectively. And therefore every body organized to do this work should include the laity as well as the clergy, because they no less than these are called of the Lord to be His workmen.

It is one of the most blessed achievements of the reformation by Luther to have brought to light again the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, and that this doctrine has found and is finding more and more a place in the consciousness of Christians. In the Romish church the people have no franchise with regard to teachers and priests, neither elective, corrective nor directive, none whatever; all they have to do is to accept the teachers and pastors sent to them, avail themselves of their ministrations such as they are, render obedience to them, and pay heavily for the "privileges" they enjoy. They owe and control no schools and monasteries, no book and printing establishments, no churches and cathedrals, in short, nothing of what is commonly called church property, though they expend millions upon millions of dollars annually to secure such property—for their masters. And according to their belief they have

no need of such things; they are taught and they believe that the pope is to govern the church, the clergy are to build it up, and they themselves to pay the bills, and that beyond this they have no rights nor responsibilities in such matters —all by an order divine. In direct opposition to this the Scriptural doctrine of the priesthood of all believers places the entire work of the Church into the hands of the whole body of Christians alike, so that under God and subject to His Word every believer is charged with the government and work of the Church no less than with the burden of its expenses. Accordingly the Lutheran Christian joins his brethren in the work of educating, calling and supporting teachers and pastors not only because these are to teach and preach the Word of God *to* him but *for* him also to others, he being fully conscious of the fact that the Lord has made it *his* duty to have the Gospel proclaimed to as many souls as will give ear to it. And not only has he the call to see to it as much and as well as he can, that this be done; but the other also that it be done aright, that is, in full obedience to and in accord with the Scriptures. This being the case, he is entitled to a voice in the management as well as in the creation of all those organizations, institutions and agencies of the Church by means of which he is expected to discharge the office of his priesthood. Hence, with regard to synods in particular, they who in the premises can properly constitute its mempership are none other but Christians; and these without distinction, except such as the head of the Church Himself requires to be made. And He has enjoined but one, to-wit, unity in the one true faith and a life consistent with it. By divine right other distinctions, such as of clergy and laity, of rich and poor, of wise and foolish, and the like, cannot be made in the composition of a synod's

membership. If Christians deem it advisable to sanction any churchly body otherwise constituted and of their own accord intrust it with some of their churchly interests, they do so by human right; and there is no Word of God forbidding this. The history of the Church, however, teaches this to be an inexpedient and dangerous practice; and therefore the greatest care should be exercised whenever it is followed. Moreover, no one can really shirk his God-given responsibilities; and hence, charging others with any work the Lord has given him to do, the Christian must keep in his own hands the control of his trustee; for do what he will, for the doing of that work and for the right doing of it, the Lord will call him to account. Trusts, it must be borne in mind, are not unconditional gifts. By them a man may in some things indeed rid himself of the personal discharge of some obligation, but never of his responsibility for it. The same holds true of Christian congregations.

In the second place: The fact that synods are usually put into the category of bodies rather than that of corporations, is significant. The one is the product more of life, the other an effect more of law. Synods to be what they should and to be successful, must be a spontaneous growth and not a forced establishment. That its entire membership thoroughly know its business and have the heart and will to attend to it, is the fundamental condition of success in church affairs more than in anything else man may have to do. Now that each Christian and Christian congregation, who as members enter the body of a synod, understand what the work of the Lord is, and be conscious of their mission with regard to it and be heartily willing to do all they can: such a knowledge and consciousness and motive power are the chief elements in the

composition of a synod. But there is still another that must be added to them; an element which, though not in itself, is nevertheless relatively just as important and necessary as are those named. It is, that the membership of synod recognize fully the necessity, the lawfulness and the advantages of the synodical method of doing the Lord's work. No matter how well a people may know what is to be done and how zealous they may be for its doing, nothing will be accomplished as long as they do not know how to go about it. As long, therefore, as its members do not rightly understand what their synod is really for, and are not thoroughly convinced that it offers to them the best agency in the world by which to do the work of their holy priesthood, that long they will make but indifferent workmen, if workmen at all; and that long the body itself is apt to prove a failnre. On the other hand: where every Christian is taught what His Lord wants him to do in His kingdom, and then is shown that he can by himself do little or nothing of the great work before him, and thus is led to unite with his brethren in the establishment and support of the local congregation; and, this done, when he and the whole congregation are made sensible of the fact that even they are not equal to the work if isolated from others and that therefore a more general body is required to prosecute it with any prospect of success—where this is done, and thoroughly done, there Christian synods will spring up and grow and prosper as a planting even of the good Lord Himself. And by the way: a sermon now and then in answer to the question, Why do we belong to synod?. would be a very good thing in any church. It might prove to be a most fruitful study for the pastor and bring most needful information to the people. The notion, for example, that

synods are designed to serve the purposes of a cheap intelligence-office for preachers without congregations and for congregations without preachers, and other such low ideas not yet exploded everywhere, might thus be made to give room for broader and better views.

In the third place: synods, to amount to anything, must necessarily be invested with authority of some sort and to some extent; without all authority it would be difficult to conceive of it as an organized body. What may have been its origin and whatever may be its true meaning, the writer does not profess to know; but the fact is that of late years the term "advisory bodies merely" has haunted the brains of many good people; and, there can be no doubt, it is doing not a little mischief among the working forces of the Church. If the term is used, as some say it is, in opposition to the papistic doctrine that the church can legislate by divine right and hence impose obligations divinely binding, very well; but the term is a misnomer inasmuch as it denies too much and affirms too little. Again, if it is used in opposition to the view that synods lawfully can have and in reality must have some legislative and disciplinary powers, then is it false: it would forbid what the Scriptures allow; and it would hinder what they enjoin. Or again, if it is used as a sort of bait or blind to capture suspecting game—and it is to be feared that such is the case here and there—then is the term become odious and its use should be discouraged.

According to the modern conception of it as an organization, a synod devoid of all authority and with no rights accorded it beyond that of giving advice—a body merely advisory—is a thing wholly chimerical. It may be possible so to constitute a mere assembly, but never a society fully

organized. Indeed, it would be hard to conceive how by the simple act of advice only an organization of any kind could be at all effected, seeing that an organization springs into existence by the act of laying down and subscribing to principles and laws no less than to rules and regulations. And not only is its inception and creation attended with the adoption of laws; but provision is generally made for the continuance of such legislative action. "Laws and by-laws, rules and regulations, such as are not in conflict with the Word of God and Articles A and B of this Constitution may at any time be made, or changes may be made provided," etc.: such in substance is the provision found in the fundamental law of all religious societies. If now in full conformity with this article a body acting under it subsequently either makes a new law or changes an old one—and where is this not done?—what does it do then but legislate? It legislates; but of course in a manner peculiar to itself: not as God makes laws, nor as a power ordained of God makes laws, but as a human institution and therefore only in the sense in which human institution can do such things. Hence it cannot legislate in the affairs of God, nor in the affairs of the State, nor in those of anybody single or corporate outside of itself; only in its own affairs, and in these only as conditioned above. So too are its laws binding, but binding again in a manner peculiar to themselves: not as the laws of God, or of the State, but as synodical laws, as laws which have force only within its own bounds, and which bind their subjects not as men and Christians but as members of the synod under whose jurisdiction they have placed themselves. That by the action of synod the members may not be unduly imposed on nor be tyrannized over, nor be offended in conscience, nor have the Word and

will of God transgressed in any way whatever: against all this they must secure themselves in the fundamental conditions of the compact.

A closer scrutiny of the facts will show that there are no such things as synods that have come into existence by advice only and whose existence is secured by it and whose operative powers are confined to it alone. For "an advisory body merely" to have whole pages of laws and by-laws and big records telling of old laws changed or abolished and of new ones created, and of rules amended and of resolutions passed, and of measures enforced; that—unless violence can be done to language without reproach—is, to-day the least, a strange anomaly. That such bodies are not what they give themselves out to be is a happy inconsistency. If not, how could they preserve for any length of time their doctrinal integrity and purity of character, to say nothing here of their practical efficiency? Yes, if all its members were from among the elect and never fell from grace, then of course there would be neither persistent error in the doctrine nor obdurate corruption of the life, and therefore little need for self-protecting authority. Such synods, however, are hardly found in this world; at least not hereabouts. Persons and things being as they are, fallible and frail people, whole congregations of them, do find their way into synods despite everything that can be done to prevent it. And then, what is worse, the fallible do err at times and the frail come short of doing as they should; so that among the objects of a synod the first and foremost is this, to see to it that its members abide in the ways of truth and godliness. Now it is true that laws and resolutions and forces of a similar order never can correct the erring and change for the better a sinner's heart. Such things, when done at all.

are effected only by the Word of God. But if this should fail in its gracious office, as not seldom it does, what then? Shall the incorrigible member be retained? That were contrary to the will of God, an injury to the body and perhaps to the member. Shall he then be advised out? If so, suppose he spurns the advice? No, he must be forced out; and the body must insist that it be vested with authority to do this very thing. But the power of expulsion implies the power of trial, that is, of inquiry and of every action that necessarily precedes an intelligent and just sentence. Whatever patience then a synod may have to exercise in its endeavor to convince the congregations that it should be entrusted with disciplinary powers, all patience failing of the result aimed at, it must in the end insist that its membership submit to discipline wherever this has become necessary. If not, the synod itself will in time be constrained either to dissolve or forfeit its claim to being an orthodox Christian body. Sooner or later one or the other will be the inevitable outcome; for where in effect, and to speak plainly, the members can say, "We teach what we please and walk as we please, what business is that to you? members we are and members we shall remain, do what you may!" and the synod really have no constitutional power either to bend or break such members by the proper discipline, there the seeds of corruption and disintegration will surely be sown and bear their evil fruit. No, as regards questions of doctrine and morals, there is no escape from the conclusion that the visitatorial and disciplinary power is an imperative necessity, and that therefore the right and duty of its exercise should be provided for in the constitution of every synod.

There is nothing found in all the Scriptures on which

the right of a synod, at any time to inquire into the doctrinal and moral standing of its member, can be questioned. On the contrary, there is much contained in them which involves this right and, under circumstances, would imply its exercise as a bounden duty; as, for example, when rumors of heresy or of immorality are reported to it of a certain congregation within its bounds. If then a synod may have failed in its covenant articles to secure for itself this power and its exercise, it may at any time adopt a law or by-law to that effect. For the individual member the question will then arise, whether he will help to pass such a measure and submit to its enforcements, or not. Should he oppose it, but the membership generally adopt it, then is it become a law of synod all the same, and hence a law binding him as a member and so long as he remains a member. Should he persist in his opposition, the synod has the full right to make his expulsion the penalty of his insubordination, and it can make use of that right whenever it seems fit to do so. In connection with this, however, it must be constantly borne in mind—and the truth of it cannot be reiterated too often—that no law and no resolution can be of more than a directive and protective value; never can they bear within themselves and impart the motive-force of their own execution. They declare what is to be done and, it may be, what is to be done with him who will not comply with them; but the right will to do them can only come from God by the Gospel.

If in matters directly effecting the doctrinal and moral character of synods these stand in need of more than advisory power, how about its authority in such things as condition the efficiency of their operations—in things which

are the unrestrained fruits of Christian love and are sacredly guarded by Christian liberty? Difficult as it may be to fix the exact limits and to determine the necessary modifications of their authority in these things, it is an easy task to show that here too more than advisory powers are required if synods are to accomplish the purposes for which they are created.

In their membership's Christian love and liberty of action synods have given to them, by the one the right working power and by the other the blessed privilege of doing the Lord's work as it seems best to them. Both are the gifts of God. The one is shed abroad in the hearts of men by the Gospel, and there is no other means by which it can come; the other is secured to the Christian by the same Gospel, and this is its best safeguard. In so far, then, it would seem that a synod could have neither need nor use for anything more than the Word of God, and that with respect to such things the advisory power were all-sufficient. In one way, yes; in another no. And the latter again in self-protection over against the waywardness and the want of those things which condition a synod's success. Especially is this the case where love is turned to hatred and liberty to license, as is not seldom the case. In such an emergency a synod must, by the terms of its constitution, be able to act with more than advisory power. If not, what is to be done with members who, whether they say so or not, *will* not work with the body of their connection, and who in utter disregard of all exhortations persist in their evil course? Are these to be retained? Not if a synod have respect for itself and love for the Lord whom it would serve; for such members are become a drain and a drag, and things so grievous and scandalous no body can endure for

any length of time. Dead to giving and serving but quick to take and be served as they usually are, they are parasites ravaging what we have recognized to be a planting of the Lord. And not only do they rob their fellow members; by their evil example they also offend, discourage and hinder them, and thus tend to cripple the usefulness of the entire body. Having become manifest as dead branches, and all hope of infusing life into them having been put to shame, they must be cut off; become of them what may, they belong not where they are.

Having ascertained what authority should be given a synod to act in extreme cases as touching the doctrines, the morals and the general activity, or rather the inactivity of some of its members, the question of its jurisdiction is solved only in its most important aspects; its more delicate and difficult features, it must be admitted, have thus far only been hinted at. What renders the problem of synodical authority so very difficult and its solution so very embarrassing is the fact that a surrender of personal and congregational rights is involved in it, and involved in it to an almost indeterminable extent. As has been shown, an organized body is hardly possible and can be of no use unless it be clothed with authority. But now, the authority which is to come to the body must come from the members; and hence what the one gains the other loses; so it would seem at least. The disposal to others of one's powers and rights and liberties, however, is an unalloyed pleasure to hardly any body, is attended with no inconsiderable danger, and should take place only on the most careful conditions. In their capacity of members, Christians and congregations should desire the body to have as much authority as it can in any way make use of; but as Christians and congrega-

tions simply, they should at the same time want to retain as much of their powers and privileges as they may want to make themselves useful, if need be, independently of synod —yea, and to secure themselves against all possible encroachments. However, all the parties concerned being Christians and desirous of laboring for the same Lord in the same cause, this real or apparent antagonism of interests finds its unity in the one work common to both; and to this singleness of purpose both must look for an equitable and satisfactory adjustment of the trouble perplexing them.

The first thing to be attended to here is, to settle definitely on the work which the body is to do. In order to this the principle should be applied that as a rule nothing be made the business of synod which can be done just as well by agencies existing antecedent to it. As a congregation should not be burdened with things which individual persons or families are perfectly able to bear, no more should a synod be charged with affairs to the discharge of which a congregation is in every way fully equal. Synods are created to do and facilitate the doing of so much work of the Church as cannot be done or be done nearly as well without them; and of that kind of work there is enough to keep them busy.

Its work defined, the next thing in order is to enable it do it. That is, within the sphere of the work assigned and adequate to its thorough and faithful execution the synod must have given to it the full authority to act, as also the means required to carry out the task with which it is charged. When it is said, within the sphere of its work, the intention is to so circumscribe its authority as to preclude all undue interference with private and congregational rights. Of course, on account of the close relation

between member and body, it may be hard to tell always just where the congregation's business ends and the synod's begins. But however fine and irregular it may be, the dividing line is somewhere drawn; and when all the parties in search of it really fear the Lord and love His Church, it will be found with little trouble. The discipline, for example, of a church-member according to Matt. 18. is the business exclusively of the congregation to which he belongs; still a synod *may* be called on to approve the action, and it *must* call to account the congregation reported guilty of unjust excommunications. In either case, the discipline is not taken out of the congregation's hands, where the Lord has put it; for the synod simply reviews the action taken by the congregation in order to ascertain whether this, *as its own member*, has or has not violated any plain precept of God's Word. In short, it does not in any sense subject to discipline the member of the congregation, but the congregation itself as its own member; and to arrive at a just dicision in this it makes inquiry, and no more, into the case of the former.

In the fourth place: The ends of a Christian synod can only be accomplished by work, by much and hard work, and then only when this is wisely and willingly laid hold of and pushed forward by all. Moreover, the greater part of the work is of such a nature that it takes money, much money and money all the time to carry it on. Manifest as these facts must be to all who have eyes to see, for one or another reason they are always among the last that enter the understanding and heart of a synod's membership. And yet what plainer propositions can there be in the wide world than these: first, that he who unites with others in a common cause must himself labor with them in order to

work or fight it out, as the case may be; and secondly, that he who would hold property with others and employ men to use and manage it, must help to pay for the property to be acquired and for the services to be engaged. But notwithstanding their plainness, there are in every synod much ignorance and not a little transgression, it may be wilful transgression, just with regard to these two features of it. To covet a share in property and to hire laborers without wanting to pay for either, is sinful; and when such a spirit is allowed to prevail with entire impunity, the body preyed upon by it will be of little use. It is true, there is nothing said about colleges and seminaries, orphans' homes, books and papers and other things of this description, in the Lord's commandment, Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; but inasmuch as this can hardly be done now without such auxiliaries, the labor and expense of providing them cannot be avoided, and in so far the command, Go ye! means also: Give of your time, of your energies, of your gold and silver, that the will of the Lord be done. If then a congregation has, of its own free choice, entered a synod in order through its instrumentality to discharge its divine commission of preaching the Gospel, that synod is become for it the body within whose bounds and under whose directions that congregation is to do her more general Church-work. The synod selected to do her work has a special claim on her sympathy, intercession, counsel, support and hearty co-operation generally. Desiring the use of a synod, a congregation should be willing also to help bear the burden of its labor and cost. In all equity, there can be nothing clearer than this.

Look at it then from whatever side one may, and it becomes evident that if a congregation wishes to stand in

synodical connection, it must necessarily put itself under some jurisdiction lying beyond and outside of itself, submit to some inconveniences, and expect to be called on repeatedly for substantial contributions. Did a synod offer no equivalent for the independency surrendered and for the duties assumed, it were foolish for a congregation to enter the body. But, assuming that the synod is at all what it should be, there is not only a full equivalent but a positive gain to be secured in lieu of any apparent loss incurred by membership in it. With an eye to the costs of it only, people might well be deterred from connection; but when once they understand the supreme advantages of it, they will not want to do without — not if they are sensible Christians. Whatever synods are and have, the congregations constituting them have made them what they are and given them what they have. Strictly speaking, however, any power conferred, any liberty surrendered, any money expended by congregations, are things not given away in the full sense of the term. These things as put into the hands of synods are not absolute gifts with which they might do as they please; but they are treasures to be used and managed by them as they are directed, and subject to account. The powers of synod becoming operative and doing precious work, are still the powers of the congregations from whence they come; and hence the work they produce is in reality the congregations' work. The same is true of any money they may have contributed. It was not given away; it was, strictly speaking, invested. The good it does is done by those who have made the investment; and the special satisfaction attends it that the money, placed as it is, does more good by far than it could do in their own hands or if otherwise placed. Never must the all-important

fact be lost sight of that synods are an agency and its members the agents, and that both are controlled by the Christian congregations constituting them — that they are a kind of mechanism employed by Christians to do the work of their Lord.

Through the instrumentality of synods Christians have their ministers and missionaries, their youth and the teachers of their youth educated; have their orphans taken care of, have themselves provided with wholesome literature, have the kingdom of God built up from within and without, have safe-guards thrown around the inestimable treasures with which God has favored them — in short, by them they are benefited in a thousand ways. Knowing of a better way, Christians are free to choose it; but if not, let them avail themselves of what the Lord has given them by the wisdom of the Church: the institution of Christian synods.

C. H. L. S.

CHRISTMAS AND EASTER SCENES IN JERUSALEM.

From the German of Professor H. Guthe, of Leipzig, by G. H. S.

The visitor at the Catholic cloisters or at the institutions of Christian charity in Jerusalem generally is presented with pressed flowers from the holy land, neatly and tastefully arranged on white card paper. These are given him as a memento of his visit and also as a mute reminder to contribute to these institutions. Some of these flowers he will find of most beautiful color, but some also that are withered and thorny and had lost the sap of life apparently already when they were picked. The object of this arrangement is evident. The withered thorns point to the

never-to-be forgotten crown of thorn worn by the suffering Savior, which had been woven out of the rough and bushy thorns of that country for the Savior's brow, while the beautiful and brilliant flowers point to the new glory of mankind which has been prepared for them through the reconciliation with God that was effected in this land.

Flowers and thorns! Take these contraries in the general sense of an expression of pleasant and disagreeable memories, and we will have the characteristic feature that marks everything in Jerusalem and the holy land. The antiquarian student in his researches indeed finds many beautiful fruits for his labor, but at the same time also many blind blossoms. The linguist will still find interesting remnants of the old national language, but generally he hears only a disagreeable jargon of the original. The same is the experience of the student of the history of religion and of the church, who examines the religions and confessions established for hundreds of years in Palestine. He may happen to find in an unsightly exterior a noble kernel, but often the kernel has become lifeless and the exterior shines only in a new and mechanically acquired light. In the Easter and Christmas scenes also, which it is my intention here to describe, these peculiar contrasts are seen.

Let us direct our eyes first to the persons whose presence at these festivals make the latter a variegated kaleidoscope. Weeks already before Christmas the first pilgrims present themselves at the gates of Jerusalem in order to celebrate the festivity of Christ's birth in the near Bethlehem. Undoubtedly every one of them steps upon the threshold of the sacred city with a feeling of reverence, and many give a loud expression of their joy that after a long

and tedious trip they have at last reached the sacred goal. It is true indeed that the great conveniences of travel which have been established more and more in our century, are robbing the pilgrims' tour of its danger and its romance. He who in earlier years undertook a trip to the Holy Land prepared his last will and testament before he left and took impressive leave from relatives and friends, for he knew that in undertaking such a trip, he was in danger of losing his life. Pirates attacked his vessel upon which the pilgrim crossed the Mediterranian, and if the heavy bark had escaped these as well as the storms and the waves, the pious pilgrim considered every "Moslem," every "Turk" and every "Gentile" to be an evil demon threatening his life and possessions. Accordingly the expression "to go to Joppa" in Low German means the same as going to one's death. Things have changed in this regard. Railroads and steamers bring the traveler comfortably to Joppa, the harbor for Jerusalem, and there he finds a number of conveyances ready, whose owners are very willing to relieve him from the task of going on foot to the holy city. And if the traveler, as a special indication of piety, is anxious to make this trip on foot, he can do so with as much safety as he takes a walk to the hills in our own country.

Since in our days the coasts of Syria also have been opened to the general traffic of commerce and business, we find but a very small number who actually with the pilgrim-staff in their hands and the water-skin and bread-sack at the sides travel from their distant homes to the gates of Jerusalem. While these exceptional few, amid the great exertions of a long journey, walk from the wilds of Russia or the valleys of the Caucausus, or the highlands of Armenia, they do not cease to keep enkindled in their

hearts the flame of hope that finally the towers and cupulos of the holy city will break upon their view. For such travelers after the old style it is not inappropriate that they greet with tears of joy the cupulo of the Holy Sepulchre Church, that they sink down upon their knees and pour out prayers of warm gratitude to heaven, because the arduous difficulties of the journey have been safely overcome. When such men do these things, there is a meaning in them, and it makes a deep impression.

In the year 1881 I saw two princes from the distant Abyssinia, two sons of the royal family on the blue Nile, which house to the present day yet leads back its origin to king Solomon, and upon this bases its claim to legitimate royalty, entering the Joppa gate at Jerusalem. For months they had traveled together and had been with each other day after day, yet it seemed that, as if after a long separation, after many dangers, they only here for the first time could meet each other as having reached in safety their goal, and here they fell into each others arms and, not mindful of those around, they embraced each other. So great was their joy that they seized each other by the hands and again and again kissed each other. The dark sons of Africa were the cynosure of the eyes of all the Asiatics and Europeans that stood around. Although the episode from beginning to end was most remarkable, yet the expression of their joy was so honest and sincere, that every spectator was filled with a hearty sympathy.

From December on the number of pilgrims increase every month, and in March and April reaches its maximum. The total number is subject to fluctuation; in times of war there are fewer, in times of peace, more strangers. It is moreover a further fact that since the peace of Paris in

1856, which ended the war in the Krim, the number of pilgrims, especially in the west, has largely increased. While the number in 1853 was not over 4,000, there were in Jerusalem in March 1858 no less than 13,475 Christian travelers. I have not at my disposed statistics from the last years with reference to the various Christian Confessions represented, but it is a matter that cannot be disputed, that the visitors to the Holy Land are not fewer but more than ever before. And since in addition to the Christian pilgrims, Jews and Moslems also hasten to Jerusalem in March and April for religious purposes, and the city numbers about 25–30,000 resident inhabitants, the annual advent of the pilgrims signifies an addition of fifty per cent. over and above the other months of the year. Of the pilgrims, in order to visit the sacred places, some remain near the city and others within the walls, and go from one shrine to another. They fill the narrow streets; they stand in front of the bazaars; they form picturesque groups in the open places, before the cloisters and hospices, in which they have found a lodging place. If the merchant in Jerusalem or the Bethlehem mechanic does no business in these months, he is compelled to go hungry the rest of the year, for the greater portion of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Bethlehem live all the year 'round from the money of these numerous strangers. For this reason every chance and every opportunity is made use of to get from the stranger one piece of silver and gold after the other, and since nearly all the people of the city are directly or indirectly connected with this trading business, it happens that at least on this one occasion the oriental seems to value time. But he consoles himself with the fact that he now has a good deal of money in his pocket, for this is a pleasure he does not enjoy during the rest of

the year, on the contrary, his experience is then, that he has a great deal of time and but little money. And even he prefers the former condition of affairs.

It is impossible that the eye should not enjoy a rare feast in looking at a promiscuous multitude crowding together from Europe, Africa, and Asia. The most noticable is the odoriferous Russian, who seems to enjoy his sheepskin coat as much in the Holy Land as he does in the villages of his native land or before the great Cathedral in St. Petersburg. Greeks and Rumanian noblemen move in European costumes in the crowd, but are easily distinguished by their red fez from the representatives of other peoples of Southern Europe. The shrewd representative of the Levante, in his wide trousers, or notwithstanding them, knows how to walk in a most dignified manner. The Bulgarian pleases the eye with his beautiful costume; the Georgian by his tall figure and the fire of his eyes, that gleam forth from beneath his long eye-lids, and by his interesting national apparel; the beautiful Armenians love to show their wealth by means of solid gold ornaments on their garments. All the poorer are the clothes in which the black son of Africa makes his appearance. The French Marquis, the Italian Count, the Spanish Grande are accustomed to unite with their devotions the display of grandeur, but observe a proud reticence over against the multitude. The German has a thoughtful and earnest eye, but he disappears easily in the multitude, since the Protestant travelers naturally do not join in with the pilgrims' processions, and only the German Catholics are present. But we would forget an important feature in the doings of this multitude, if we would forget to mention that Greek, Russian, and Syrian Christians often take their families with them on

their pilgrimages, and that the presence of women, men children, adults of every age, add a peculiar charm to the picturesque groups.

The great multitude of pilgrims gives to Jerusalem a festive appearance of a peculiar kind. Let us leave out of consideration entirely the Jews and the Moslems, and then we will see the members of the most important Christian peoples — the Protestants being represented chiefly by Americans and English — assembled in Jerusalem to celebrate Christmas and Easter. Even if a large portion of them have not come for religious purposes but only from a spirit of curiosity yet, by far the most of these strangers have undertaken the journey for a pious notion. Some want to pray at Christ's grave; others seek hours of quiet meditation and prayer, or are searching for a cure for some suffering of their soul at the place which the real Savior had touched; others desire through repentance and fasting to secure forgiveness of sins and gain pardon in Jerusalem; others, finally, try to secure for themselves a happy hour of death by means of this pilgrimage. However different the spirit may be which actuates them, the same foundation always remains for all upon which they base their thoughts, namely, Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world. But since the curious and the student also comes to this country on account of its importance for the history of the Christian religion, their presence, too, goes to show how closely this land and its various localities are connected with the Christian faith. Thus the numberless pilgrims and strangers, although in a different manner and degree, all combine to prove the great fact of the decisive influence of Christianity on the spiritual life of all these nations and of the individuals; and this is the confession, be it by word or by

action, which all the sons of the many nations of the earth make, the members of so many nationalities as are to be found assembled at no other place under the sun.

This world indeed, to use the words of Luther, be "a multitude of all tongues assembled in one faith," and would leave a profound impression, did not some features also awake different feelings. Such features we detect already when we try to learn the different types of religious faith that appear here especially on the celebration of the Easter festivities. I, of course, do not think of those who take the words of Christ, e. g., Matt. 10, 38, literally, and on the repeated *via dolorosa*, on which Jesus is said to have carried his cross, actually do the same. Such mistaken ideas of following Christ need not be searched for especially; they are everywhere evident enough. But those characteristic features to which I wish to draw attention here are not noticed by all; they are seen only under special and favorable examination. In general, with the few exceptions soon to be mentioned, the conduct of the pilgrims in these general religious services, is quiet and correct; even in the midst of crowds the bearing is generally respectable. Such pilgrims can be regarded as a fair average, and the value or benefit of their worship is something upon which no judgment can be ventured.

The limits of this average type are passed over by those persons whose whole soul is taken up by the festivities just then in progress, whose features express the collection of thoughts within and appear to experience themselves the symbolical action which is just being performed: they are entirely absorbed in what the priest is performing before their eyes. These people are accordingly generally found in the immediate vicinity of the priest, or at places where

they can closely observe the religious ceremony, or at a side altar at which a priest may be reading mass for a deceased member of family. I have not found this type of engrossed piety expressed in a nobler and purer form than in the faces of the beautiful Rumanian and Greek women. Such a worship makes a solemn and awe inspiring impression, and, I might say, sanctifies the whole surroundings.

Entirely different is the type of deep devotional glow which drags the spiritual into the domain of the senses. In this a powerful, independent nature shows itself, and for this reason probably this phenomena is not found in the large masses, but only in smaller circles, in the smaller chapels, whose decorations are adapted to excite the imagination, and whose half darkness favor optical delusions or make possible the attractiveness of mental delusions. Here such persons are wont to sit in a corner waiting on the manifestation of a sign from heaven, excited to this by the services just closed, without regard to the people that press forward near by to kiss some religious relic, concentrating their two glowing and awe inspiring eyes upon some picture of Mary or of Christ, their faces covered with a purple glow, agitated in body, in limbs and members by involuntary movements. Suddenly the light in the chapel is changed, because the sun, hitherto hidden by a cloud, breaks forth in his splendor; or, on the other hand, his bright light is suddenly obscured by a thick cloud, and then a wonderful gleam of excitement and intense gratification spreads over the glowing face of the worshipper; he is sure that the sacred image has given him a sign with the hand and his vivid imagination at once suggests to him the meaning of the sign. This is the dangerous moment for the worshipper himself; for he falls a victim to his own de-

ception; or also for his surroundings who have without suspicion been watching the strange course of events and cannot understand it as a natural process and are likewise deceived. Should, however, those around detect the deception, they would not escape the accusation of unbelief. I have never seen this type of glowing religious enthusiasm and ecstacy in the members of the Greek Church, but only in the adherents of the Roman Catholic,—something that can scarcely be accidental. The place where I saw what has been described, was the Chapel of the Appearance of Mary in the church of the Holy Sepulchre. It belongs to the Franciscan monks, and this circumstance suggests the idea of connecting this species of piety with that of Franz of Assisi, the founder of this order, to whose religious zeal was attributed the possibility to bring back into the presence of the congregation the risen and transfigured Lord.

But we must descend from the height of pure worship first described by me still lower than the type last described, namely to the mechanical, at least such to all appearances, to which expression is given in the most disgusting forms. Among the Greeks it is the custom to set lights before the images of the saints. At these places there is each evening an animated going and coming. A wax candle is lighted, fastened, the ordinary crosses made, and the worshipper goes on his way to make room for his neighbor. Scarcely a sign of true worship can be detected. Among the Latins the kissing of relics, e. g. of a pretended piece of the column to which Christ was tied when He was scourged, assumes disgusting forms. It may suffice to narrate that the crowding to this column is so great in Passion week that from 20 to 30 persons in the short time of a minute press this little piece of wood to their mouths. The entrance to the place

is so small that it is impossible without pushing one another to get near, and that the spirit of worship suffers under such jostling is a matter not doubtful to the looker-on. Yet one example may suffice to show how senseless this kind of worship spreads. In the immediate vicinity of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, separated from it only by a street, there stands an old wall with a beautiful gate which belong to the buildings formerly belonging to the St. John knights and now is the property of the Prussian crown. About ten years ago the ruins were dug out of the dirt, so that they can now be seen by all. Many pilgrims too, and especially the Greeks, go through this street. Only six years ago they began to show their veneration for this wall by means of kisses and crosses, although it has not the least historical significance for the history of Christ or any of the apostles or any saint, and has never been connected with the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Nobody can say what was the beginning of this innovation. In 1881 the German Consul attempted to put an end to the proceeding, but it failed entirely.

It is not pleasant, but rather saddening to see such pervaded forms of worship at the very spot where Christ went into death to unite mankind in worship in the spirit and in the truth. But just these perversions show more plainly yet than the crowds of pilgrims that go up to Jerusalem every year that what marks this city over against all the others under the sun is that it is a sacred city.

Jerusalem is for all Christian Confessions, and for us Protestants also, a holy city, but to the Protestants in a different sense from the Roman Catholic or Greek Churches. We call it a holy city only because the leading historical facts upon which our faith is founded took place there.

THE AGE OF MAN GEOLOGICALLY CONSIDERED.

By S. R. Pattison, Esq., F. G. S.

From the Journal of Christian Philosophy.

I. THE QUESTION STATED.

The recent soil of England, or "made ground," in which the relics of our predecessors lie buried, shows successive occupation of the surface by Kelt and Saxon, Norman and English. We can assign, from contemporary history, dates to everything which we find in it. This can also be done around the shores of the Mediterranean, and in more remote Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt. But in turning up the gravel below the "made ground," or raking out the bottom of caves, we discover mysterious traces of human handicraft respecting which history is absolutely silent. We find rough stone tools, so buried as to show that those who fabricated and used them lived prior to all other monuments, prior to ordinary history, prior even to the legendary period of our annalists. As the oldest known indications of man on the earth they possess for us a powerful and unique interest, far beyond their mere claims on our curiosity as articles of early art.

We can fix within a few centuries the date of the earliest inscribed monuments; and then by adding four or five hundred years to this, in order to allow for the antecedents of the state of things which they represent, we get an approximate date for the origin of the historical period back beyond the days of Abraham. With regard, however, to the antecedent period, brought to light by the flint implements, we are utterly at a loss, so far as written records go.

There is a chasm of unknown breadth between the time of the old implements (palaeolithic) and the historic period; in the beginning of the latter we find in Western Europe smooth stone implements (neolithic, new stone) associated with pottery and relics, to which we can ascribe an antiquity of four thousand years at furthest.

The problem to be solved is the age of the preceding gravels with palaeolithic implements, which must determine the epoch of man's first appearance, where they occur.

It only adds to the mysteries surrounding the matter, to be told first, that the gravel containing these implements also contains the remains of animals now extinct; and secondly, that they are found beneath the soil, not only over Europe, but in the East. The Somme valley in France, and the Thames banks in England, are nearly representative cases of a state of things which appears to have been very general at one time, before history begins.

Scripture does not appear to throw any light on this subject, unless we find it in the few words which disclose the universal moral decadence of mankind before the flood.* It was not within the declared scope of revelation to give this information.

In order to measure the difficulty, and give some hints for its solution, we must now refer to its geological conditions.

II. GEOLOGY.

The geological term for the accumulations of soil during historical time is "recent." These have been spread over the land by the wear of the solid materials, through the agency of causes still in operation, at present rates of action.

---

*And the earth was filled with violence. . . all flesh had corrupted His way upon the earth." Genesis 6, 2.

The underlying strata are classified by geologists, in the descending scale, as quarternary, tertiary, secondary, and primary. With the last two we have nothing to do in the present inquiry, nor with the tertiary, except to observe that in its uppermost division, called the pliocene, we discover for the first time, as we ascend, the existence of the great groups of mammalian animals, with some forms of which, in the stratum above, man is found associated.†

Up to this time it is demonstrable that the surroundings were unfitted for the human race, one proof of which is, that no trace of cereal plants has been found in the tertiary strata. When we come up to the quarternary, a great number of animals previously unknown appear; and with these, late in the series, in the gravels and caves, appear the mysterious tokens of the presence of man, the summit and crown of life on this earth.

The gravel in which these discoveries are made is not spread evenly over the surface, but occurs only in patches and beds, principally along the sides of wide valleys, and above the level of the streams in their neighborhood. It is evident, on the slightest inspection, that the gravel, whilst it was being laid down, and since, has been subjected to rushes of water, which have occasionally brought down sand; and to intervals of quiet, during which fine mud was

† "Nor in the succeeding pliocene age can we expect to find man upon the earth, because of the very few living species of placental mammals then alive. The evidence brought forward by Professor Cappellini. in favor of pliocene man in Italy, seems both to me and to Dr. Evans unsatisfactory, and that advanced by Professor Whitney in support of the existence of pliocene man in North America, cannot in my opinion be maintained. It is not until we arrive at the succeeding stage, or the pleistocene, when living species of mammalia begin to abound, that we meet with indisputable traces of the presence of man on the earth."—Professor Boyd Dawkins, British Association, '82.

deposited which became loam or brick-earth when dry, so that layers of river shells, layers of land shells, and bones of land animals once living on adjacent surfaces, are now found lying in the brick-earth and gravels.

Recurring for a moment to the earlier part of the quaternary, we find the presence of ice, covering a great part of England, more than half of Russia, all Scandinavia, Prussia, North Germany, and a large extent of North America. This was the glacial epoch, of the duration of which there is no chronological evidences, nor any evidence of what may have been the condition of other regions at the same time.

The effects of the land ice of this period are to be seen in the rubble heaps and banks which dot and diversify our landscapes; and the long banks of ancient mud in the south of Scotland equally represent the action of icebergs of the old icy sea. Can we get any evidence on our subject from these sources? We believe not; for although the great majority of cases of the occurrence of implements in the gravel are undoubtedly post-glacial, yet some instances show the prevalence or near neighborhood of glacial conditions; but these may have been local only, and therefore affords us no assistance in the present inquiry.

The most recent investigators into the age of the implement gravels in the east of England (which are obviously of the same general epoch as those of the Thames and Somme), have come to the conclusion that they are post-glacial. We are told that in the valleys of the Lark in Norfolk, Little Ouse, and others, whilst great antiquity must be assigned to the implements, the evidence, thus far, fairly interpreted, will not allow us to assign to any of the

beds containing them a greater age than those usually classed as quaternary or post-glacial. Professor Blake also, a well known careful geologist, says, that so far as his own investigations have gone, he considers that there is no reliable evidence of any flint-implement-bearing bed in the east of England being of greater antiquity than that generally known as the post-glacial period.*

Taking the full prevalence of the glacial epoch as a base-line, we find that the ice which radiated from the high lands and the icebergs which streamed from the Northern Sea, have left records in lines of polished and striated rocks and scooped valleys, and lake-basins, and mud-banks, and confused stone-heaps. As local glaciers melted away, the whole land became submerged, and a fresh surface was moulded by retreating waters, and rivers; and amidst the growth of trees and plants of existing species, man now suddenly appears in these parts as a hunter and cave-dweller.

At this time the gravel-beds and caves reveal to us the existence of two kinds of gigantic elephant, two species of rhinoceros, the Auvergne bear, the sabre-toothed lion, deer, hippopotamus, and other animals mostly now extinct, with oxen stags, and red-deer, of still living species.

The climate became ameliorated towards the end of the quaternary: the reindeer, which had roamed down as far as Spain, retreated northwards.

When we speak of glacial epoch, it must be remembered that this does not imply a period of universal ice. The geology of Central Asia is yet but little known with regard to the period in question. It is quite possible that the countries beyond the range of Arctic conditions may

* Geological Magazine, January, 1883, p. 38.

contemporaneously have been the scene of some of the events of early history, for aught we know. The tribes which wandered and hunted along the edge of the great ice-cap and over the plains of the Western world, and over Greece and India, may have been the offshoots of a previous comparative civilization which obtained in some more favored spot.

But the world was not yet at rest. After the advent of man, as shown by geology, the surface was, at least in these Western parts, subjected to much turbulence and violent action. The soil where the quaternary gravels are now found, was first lifted up, and then depressed, and traversed by streams, larger and swifter than the existing rivers, though in the same direction. In the former period, the waters tore up the surface, and filled the valleys with gravels. In the latter, the valleys were excavated, and the gravel re-sorted, and interspersed with sand and mud. The formation of river terraces shows that both these movements were accompanied by long periods of repose.

Man, in England, preceded this, the last great physical revolution; and the date and duration of the latter, if discoverable, will go far to give us that of his antiquity.

The implement gravel is of the same age as the sand and mud in which the mammoth is found, with parts of the body well preserved, in icy clay in Siberia. Mammoth tusks are so numerous along the shores of the Arctic Sea as to have formed for several centuries a valuable article of commerce.

To the epoch of the gravels belong also the earliest of the cave deposits. The caves at that time were at the level of the streams on whose sides they range, but now they are at varying heights above them.

III. THE FLINT IMPLEMENTS.

It is in the gravels and brick-earth, the graves of the great mammals, and in the lowest floors of the caves, that stone tools, adapted equally for cutting, digging, or striking, appear.

The most numerous of these are shaped fragments of the pebbles themselves, or of stones obtainable hard by. They have been struck with other stones, so as to produce cutting edges and a symmetrical form; most of them show that they have been used, and some have their edges blunted by having been rolled along with the gravel. They have been abandoned or dropped, and then covered by subsequent inundations.

Dr. John Evans, in his standard work on "The Ancient Stone Implements of Great Britain," published in 1872, records discoveries of these remains in six caves and fifty-four gravel banks in England and Wales. The number of such discoveries has at least been doubled since that date and foreign localities are still more numerous. Public and private museums are everywhere displaying these shaped flints amongst the articles which appeal to curiosity and interest. They have been found in Spain, Italy, Greece, Algeria, Upper and Lower Egypt (it is said, in the conglomerate slabs of which the tombs of the kings are built), Palestine, India, and even in North America; all substantially of the same type, lying under similar conditions, of the same geological age, and apparently testifying of the same social epoch. They occur beyond the bounds of our ordinary history, and denote a community of character over an area startling from its extent. It is as though the world had at one time passed through a hunting or predatory

stage, as regards man and the mammals, interrupted by a watery catastrophe.

Doubtless some collectors of these implements have been deceived by the similarity of accidental chips to artificial forms, and have classed among the latter some of the former. The unwary have been imposed upon by counterfeit originals, which have been readily struck out to supply the demand. But these sources of error are easily unmasked and allowed for, and do not affect the conclusions which scientific men have drawn from an immense number of undoubtedly valid specimens. It cannot for a moment be disputed that the great majority of the tools are veritable works of ancient man.

At Crayford, where there are the evidences of a palaeolithic tool factory, the shape of the implements shows that they have been used for cutting, for digging, and for hammering. The bones of mammoth and rhinoceros in the same deposit, may be relics of creatures slain and dressed for food with these implements thus ready at hand.

Although flint is the best material for stone cutlery, yet every variety of quartzose or hard stone has been used. Whilst there are no polished stones amongst the palaeolithic implements, there are numerous unpolished ones accompanying those of the neolithic age, or even down to recent times. Stone being commonly at hand, and presenting or taking a cutting edge, would of course be adapted and used by all people in proportion to the difficulty of obtaining metal, and exclusively in the absence of the latter.

There is a general resemblance between all the flint tools, yet each district has its fashion, so to speak. The eye soon learns to distinguish between the almond-shaped and the spear-shaped, between the St. Acheul type and the

Hoxne type. So, too, there is a great difference in finish of tools from various places. At Clapton, in a succession of similar beds, the latest are the best finished. The French archaeologists have elevated these differences into characteristics of progression during tens and thousands of years, without any shadow of proof, and against all probability.

It is a fact that up to the present time no human bones have been found in the beds containing the tools, though there are abundant bones, teeth, tusks, and horns of animals. The reply that human bones decay quickly is not satisfactory, as other mammalian fragments are preserved in the same circumstances. We must confess ignorance, and be content to wait. In spite of this we are bound to consider the fact as established, that before the historic period there was an age, quite unrecorded in writing, during which man existed, and which, at least so far as Britain is concerned, was terminated by rushes of fresh water and changes of land level.

IV. TIME.

It is clear that once upon a time, before the uppermost gravels were laid down, the soil then forming the surface was trodden by man, who made, used, and left stone tools of a special type. Secondly, there was a time when by repeated rushes of water, these worked stones were carried forward with pebbles washed out of the surface chalk, and deposited by floods, with sand, gravel, or mud, where we now find them.

It is equally clear that the last mentioned action must have been of sufficient force and long duration to have scooped out or enlarged many existing valleys, to have tranquilly deposited sediment in some places, and in others to have allowed the accumulation of sand amongst which are remains of molluscan creatures which lived and died

there, and to allow for successive occupancy or resort by numerous tribes of larger animals, and by man. But the effects of the denudation in excavating and widening valleys are far too considerable to have been produced by the feeble causes now in operation, the disruption and displacements of strata demand violent action, and the wide-spread gravels point to floods far more powerful than the present streams could furnish. Hence time is not the only element to be considered.

The great difference in construing the foregoing facts in their bearing on time arises from the opposite opinions held by advocates of rival schools of geology. The one, following Lyell, holding that these effects were produced in the same manner and at the same rates of time as similar effects are at present, estimate the time required for wearing down river-beds into valleys, and for depositing gravel and loam by scores of thousands of years; whereas others, seeing in the records of the past positive proofs of violence, and fuller and swifter actions of force, maintain the probability of a far shorter duration, and put forward the sufficiency for all purposes of about eight thousand years from the present time. A third section of geologists, comprising many of the chief scientists of the day, decline to assign any date in years for the antiquity of man, affirming that the facts are not yet ripe for any such determination. Professor Prestwich, writing of the geological changes since the deposition of the flint implements in the Somme valley, says:

"All the phenomena indicate long periods of time. I do not, however, find that we are yet in a position to measure that time, or even to make an approximate estimate respecting it. That we must greatly extend our present chronology with respect to the first existence of man appears inevitable; but that we should count by hundreds of thousands of years is, I am convinced, in the present state of the inquiry, unsafe and premature."—*Theoretical Considerations on the Drift containing Implements*, etc. Royal Society's "Philosophical Transactions," 1862.

It is, however, surprising to find how soon the settled

course of nature obliterates all marks of such surface changes as the condition of the gravels and brick-earth indicate. The estuaries around our south-eastern coast, which have been filled up in historical times, some within the last seven hundred years, to a height of thirty feet from their sea-level, by the gradual accumulation of soil, now look like solid earth, in no way differing from the far older land adjoining. The harbors out of which our Plantagenet kings sailed are now firm well-timbered land. The sea-channel through which the Romans sailed on their course to the Thames, at Thanet, is now a puny fresh-water ditch, with banks apparently as old as the hills. In Bede's days, in the ninth century, it was a sea-channel three furlongs wide.

The palaeolithic changes, save the one disturbance when the strata were raised and broken, and the Straits of Dover formed, and the cave-cliffs raised up, and wide valleys re-excavated, do not display any phenomena requiring longer time than about a thousand years. We have then to assign some time for the disturbances referred to, and we make allowance for this in proposing less than another thousand years.

We have already observed that most of the implement gravels overlie the glacial *debris*. We may cite as a typical instance one which occurs in Swabia, and is related by the explorer, Herr Fraas. A settlement of the primitive population was discovered at Schuessenried. A hole had been dug in the glacier *debris* and the remains of their meals, sweepings, and implements that were broken or had become useless were cast into it. The first particularly excite our interest, for they enable us to determine what was the prey of those primitive inhabitants. The bones of the reindeer preponderate, the number of them being so great that Fraas believes himself justified in concluding that hundreds of them had been slain. The bones of a bear, probably not different from our *Ursus Arcticus*, occur, but are rare. There were also found bones of a glutton, and other animals belonging to the colder regions, and of a horse—of species now living. All these bones lie thickly embedded in moss, to

which they are indebted for their good state of preservation; and which itself was well preserved, and proved to be either of high northern species, or of those found near the snow line in the Alps. All the implements that were found were of stone, particularly flint, or of horn and bone. The first kind, of which six hundred specimens were collected, must have been manufactured on the spot, as appears from the occurrence of splinters. Many hard Alpine stones were gathered from the glacier *debris*. The smaller fine implements were chiefly made from reindeers' horns. The absence of every trace of pottery, as well as the rather rough form of the implements, renders it, according to Fraas, in the highest degree probable that the settlement in question is one of the very earliest, and that it was formed here at the end of the glacial period. Hence the cold climate, which is evidenced by the remains, would easily be accounted for.

Were it not for the unmistakable proofs, from changes of level, of a great physical disturbance, we might content ourselves with the conclusion that the rude flint implements were the first stage of the art of barbarians, succeeding generations of whom, after years of practice, developed further skill in the fabrications of the polished stone age. But the sequence of events has been so strangely interrupted by physical catastrophe, that we cannot lay down any such law of development, for there appears to be an absolute break, and no bridge has yet been discovered between the first and the second period. We may surmise that the men who had used the rough tools, and had been driven back by the floods and earth movements, or their successors, may have returned later on, with improved fashions in stone, and in after years, again, may have acquired by intercourse with more favored countries, the use of metals, the fabrication of pottery, and other tokens of civilization, but of this we have no evidence.

It has been contended that the progress of man from the state of comparative civilization which we may, from Scripture, infer to have been his first condition, to that of a

savage of the stone age, or vice versa, would inevitably require a lapse of very many thousand years; but the observations of modern travelers do not support this view, and in confirmation of this we may cite the following instance: Baron Nordenskioeld, in his narrative of his stay among the inhabitants of the shores of the Arctic Sea, near Behring Strait, states that two peoples of different race and language, placed under similar conditions of climates and food-supply, rapidly converge into common features and character; and he notices the quick absorption into the mass of any foreign element casually introduced. He also adds the important conclusion from his observations, that the changes which can be ascertained to have taken place historically, are changes not of progression, but of decadence. He even considers that the last Danes, who are known to have colonized Greenland in the eighth century, of whom nothing has been heard since 1406 A. D., have been converted into Esquimaux, and thus all traces of them have disappeared. He says, "A single century of complete separation from Europe would be sufficient to carry out thoroughly this alteration of the present European population of Greenland; and by the end of that period, the traditions of Danish rule would be very obscure in that land.*

We may conclude with Dr. Southall, that the palaeolithic hunters of the Somme valley did not originate in that inhospitable climate, but moved into Europe from some more genial region.†

The extent of the area over which the tools are found does not give us much help in constructing a chronology, for gravel beds, unlike the older strata, are not continuous on their level, but are constantly interrupted, and are also varying in thickness and in the nature of their materials. The difficulty of framing any general system of succession appears to be almost insuperable. Most of the smaller gravel beds have been disturbed, re-sorted, and redistributed

* Voyage of the Vega, 2, 544.

† Epoch of the Mammoth, p. 315.

by water, more than once, as their contents show. Hence the opportunity offered for the most widely differing computations of age and duration. It is precisely similar with Egyptian chronology. There are certain dynasties about which learned men are in doubt whether they were successive or contemporaneous. Each chronologist stretches or contracts these missing links as suits his own theory.

V. CONCLUSION.

M. Gabriel de Mortillet, Professor of Prehistoric Anthropology in Paris, in his work just published, *La Prehistorique Antiquite de l'Homme*, deduces from similar but more extended data of the kind we have given above, the astounding conclusion that man appeared on the earth 230,000 years ago! i. e., he adds to the six thousand years of actual history 224,000 prehistoric years,--years of stone implements, years of a progress which might be more fitly termed stagnation. This great *terra incognita* is by him peopled with an imaginary race of men beginning before the glacial epoch, continuing in southern climes whilst it lasted, returning without improvement, living on French and German soil for fifty thousand years, progressing so slowly as to learn nothing but a slight improvement in stone tools, being from generation to generation fishers and hunters only, knowing nothing of agriculture, living without domesticated animals, and without any religious ideas! Such a phase of humanity is absolutely inconceivable. It is entirely inconsistent with all that we are, and all that we know. After the endurance of this forlorn companionship with beasts during nearly 200,000 years, he says that man became an artist, i. e., he learned to scratch out lines on ivory and bone. He goes on to say, that a few thousand years after this, there was a movement of the world's population, the eastern tribes having acquired some religiosity, some knowledge of art and political life, invaded the west, and gave a new character to the mixed race which resulted from the irruption of the civilized community into the territory of our savage but simple forefathers in these western parts. Sure-

ly, all this may be fiction, may be poetry, but it is neither science nor philosophy. The assumption of the almost infinitely slow succession of about a myriad generations of shivering savages is too grotesque to be dealt with seriously, had it not had the advantage of annunciation by one of the foremost of the archaeologists of France. Well may M. Mortillet close his book, as he does, with the sage reflection, "But the prehistoric is a new science, far, very far, from having said its last word." We can only add,—very far, indeed!

With regard to time, we must again call attention to the fact that the human period has certainly extended backwards into the time when some of the great animals of which written history gives no account, were living on the earth. The mammoth, for instance, must have been known to the cave-dwellers in France, as carvings of its form on ivory and bone have been found, although legend and history are alike ignorant of its existence, Indeed, the mammoth has left more numerous traces in quarternary deposits than any other animal. Its bones and teeth are found scattered on the uplands, where they must have fallen before the valleys were re-excavated, and on the banks and levels of streams, partly brought down by the rivers and partly buried on the land they occupied whilst living. The mammoth became extinct in Siberia within very late quarternary times, if not within the historic period; but we are not furnished with any date assignable to the undoubted facts of its contemporaneity with the first men in England. We cannot tell how long they lived together.

Historians of the older school invariably commenced their works with preliminary tables, the length of which was in proportion to the writers estimate of the importance of his subject. Geologists have taken similar license; but the scientific imagination has laws, and one of these is expressed in the principle that a sufficient cause is reason enough. We have to deal with the duration of a long watery epoch, succeeding a long icy one, and with the occurrence, after the appearance of man, of a series of

physical changes of surface, resulting in the present condition of things. As there is no secular time-record available, we can only reckon by the events; and although many, perhaps the majority of geologists, studying the earth alone, would be of opinion that these events may have occupied somewhat more than eight thousand years, yet other geologists from the same facts may arrive at a different conclusion, If, therefore, from any other science or study, we have reason to believe that the race of men has existed oniy about eight thousand years, it is impossibie for geological science at present to confute or disprove it.

Can we put the case affirmatively? We have made out three stages in the quarternary, disregarding the boulder-clay as any index of time. The first stage was when man appeared; the second, when he was displaced by floods; the third, when he lived and worked on the present surface. Now naturalists bring down the close of the glacial period far into the quartenary times, for they point out that there are no palaeolithic implements found in Scandinavia, though neolithic tools abound; whence it is inferred that this district was then under ice, and uninhabitable, and continued so until the neolithic age. The neolithic age is estimated to have occurred here about four or five thousand years ago,* so that the latest glacial epoch vanished not earlier than this. If we assign any reasonable duration before this to the prior palaeolithic age, including the period of physical disturbance and of man's antecedent resort here, we arrive at seven or eight thousand years backward from the present, and no more. If this computation is well grounded, it at last dissipates all visions of fabulous antiquity.

We may be allowed to mention that neither the calculations of astronomy, nor the inductions of ethnology, afford us any certain aid in this inquiry at present.†

* Worsaal fixes its close in Denmark at about twenty-five hundred years ago.—*Primeval Antiquities*, p. 135.

† See Boyd Dawkins, address at Southampton, Nature, August 31, 1882.

It will be satisfactory to place together such few elements as we possess from history concerning the earliest dates. Babylonian authorities (a brick-record of Nabonidus‡) carry the annals of that kingdom to B.C. 3800,—the epoch of the great Sargina, supposed to have flourished within a few generations of the Flood, which the same records portray. Egyptian discoveries carry us up no higher,§ — say six thousand years from the present time. We therefore assume this to be the extreme duration and antiquity of what we may term the historic period. This includes the neolithic age in Europe and America; includes the epoch of the cromlechs and stone circles; includes the era of the prehistoric cities on the site of Mycenæ and Troy; and includes, of course, all antiquity save the palæolithic age.

The Bible, in the first chapters of Genesis, declares a limit to the antiquity of man, but does not undertake to fix it. The only materials which it offers for the calculation are genealogies given for purposes of pedigree, and evidently not chronologically complete.¶ As was to be expected, different writers have, from these, given very different computations of time. According to the construction adopted in the Septuagint, the creation of man occurred 7517 years ago; according to Dr. Hales 7294; according to the Vulgate 6067; and according to Bishop Ussher 5967.

‡ Described in Sir H. C. Rawlinson's letter to *The Athenæum*, December 9th, 1882.

§ Vide R. S. Poole, *The Cities of Egypt*, 1882, who, however, says, "The chronology of ancient Egypt is as yet undetermined, the best authorities differing by many centuries."

¶ "From the Call of Abraham it is possible to construct a chronology that cannot be far wrong. . . . Previously to that date all is uncertain, and while in a religious point of view we have everything that we want, it is as impossible to construct a scientific chronology of the world from the records in Genesis as it is to construct from these same records a scientific geology or astronomy." — The Dean of Canterbury, *O. T. Commentary*, p. 9.

Secular history, as we have seen, goes back nearly six thousand years, so that the interval between that and the Creation seems to require some extension of the ordinary chronology, to allow for the immediate antecedents of secular history and for the whole palæolithic period. If for these, and the first human period recorded in Genesis, we allow two thousand years, we get a term of about eight thousand years as warranted by deductions from history, geology, and Scripture. If further geological evidence should at any time require it, we might without violence to the Scriptures, commence our chronology a few years earlier still. With geological records of great uncertainty, and written records declared to be incomplete for this purpose, we submit that it is sufficient for us to show a near approximation between science and Scripture, and to express the conviction, founded on actual facts, that the more geology is studied and its fact ascertained, the closer does this approximation become: already this is the case in the judgment of some leading geologists, for undoubtedly the tendency of modern observation and discovery has been to bring down and modernize the mammalian and prehistoric epochs.

Finally, the matter stands thus,—the exact age of man on the earth is not ascertainable by science, but science shows to us a number of converging probabilities which point to his first appearance along with great animals about eight thousand years ago, and certainly not in indefinite ages before that.

Geology, standing beside the most ancient works of man hitherto discovered by it, interprets them as belonging to a race of savages. We know, however, too little about them to come to any such conclusion; but if this were so, we are warranted in saying that these were not the first men, and that they must have had ancestors more civilized than themselves, for the science of ethnology assures us of this. It discovers amongst the very oldest monuments open to its examination, vestiges of language and manners

which must have come from antecedent culture. Like rounded pebbles in a conglomerate rock, these worn fragments are foreign to their surroundings. On this important point we may quote the testimony of Professor Max Mueller, who says:

"What do we know of savage tribes beyond the last chapter of their history? Do we ever get an insight into their antecedents? Can we understand, what after all is everywhere the most important and most instructive lesson to learn, how they have come to be what they are? . . . Their language proves, indeed, that these so-called heathens, with their complicated systems of mythology, their artificial customs, their unintelligible whims and savageries, are not the creatures of to-day or yesterday. Unless we admit a special creation for these savages, they must be as old as the Hindoos, the Greeks and Romans, as old as we ourselves. . . . They may have passed through ever so many vicissitudes, and what we consider as primitive may be, for all we know, a relapse into savagery, or a corruption of something that was more rational and intelligible in former ages." — *India*, 1883.

We are thus led to infer that geology has not yet shown to us any traces of the first men. It may enlarge its field and continue its search for these. This science, so far as it has gone, appears to find its first specimens of humanity in a rude decivilzed condition. It discovers, at present, nothing whatever of his antecedents. But the facts which it brings before us correspond with the known sacred and profane history concerning the alas, too early condition of our race. Our science has no key to the higher mysteries of man's nature; being 'of the earth, earthy,' it leaves us in the region of the shadow of death, with, however, the natural conviction that there must be light elsewhere. Nor is this expectation disappointed, for we read, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken!" The overture to *Paradise Lost* takes up and repeats the strain:

"Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat."

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are $2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. C. H. L. Schuette, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. VI

		Page.
1.	The Mystery in Conversion, by Prof. M. Loy	321
2.	Concerning Articles of Faith, by Prof. G. H. Schodde	349
3.	Labor in the Light of the Bible, by Prof. Theo. Mees	372

Monies Received for Volume VI.

Rev. W. J. Schroyer, Rev. M. Walter, Rev. E. L. S. Tressel, Rev. S. Braaten, Rev. L. F. Meyer, Rev. C. F. Brecht, each $2.00; Rev. L. M. Baum, $4.00; Rev. J. Doermann, $4.50; Rev. Th. Eich, $5.00; Rev. V. A. M. Mortensen, E. S. Holland, Rev. G. Cronenwett, each $6.00.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. VI.—No. VI.

DECEMBER, 1886.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1886.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VI. NOVEMBER, 1886. No. 6.

THE MYSTERY IN CONVERSION.

That man's conversion and salvation is due wholly and exclusively to the grace of God, is the clear teaching of Scripture. "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Eph. 2, 8. This grace is brought to men by the Word and Sacraments, and men may resist it, as many do resist it. No one can by his natural power accept it. Our nature is hostile to it, and only resistance can emanate from us. Yet some men are converted. From this some infer that in some instances God exerts a power that in other instances He does not exert. An easy solution of the problem is found in the doctrine of absolute predestination and in irresistible grace for the elect. But the solution, even if it did satisfy reason, does not satisfy Scripture. This teaches that the Lord desires to save men and they refuse to be saved. His grace is sufficient for all, as the redemption is sufficient for all. By the power which is extended through the means, all to whom these are brought might be saved. The reason why not all are converted is that some persist in opposing the divine work. That divine work always begins when the grace is extended, and the grace thus inevitably bestowed continues to do its work until conversion, sanctification and glorification are effected, unless man prevents it. It

may be resisted at any stage before and after conversion. Whatever is done for the soul's regeneration and final salvation is done by grace alone. Man has no ability to aid the work in any degree or in any respect. He can of his own power only resist. Some resist the grace prior to conversion, so that this never takes place; some resist it after conversion, so that final salvation is not secured; some permit grace to do its work and are saved.

It is often asked, Why, since all are naturally averse to the spiritual things thus brought before the mind, do not all shut their eyes and hearts against them? All are alike unable to understand and receive the Gospel, and God is desirous that all alike should understand and receive it. How then can there be such a difference as Scripture and experience show among men in the attitude assumed towards the Word of God and the grace which it offers?

It is beyond all controversy that the fact is as presented, whether we are able to explain it or not. Any effort to solve the problem must therefore be regarded as an essay towards satisfying the requirements of psychological and theological science, not towards furnishing a support for the Christian's faith. Only in that view do we make any further reply to the question proposed, or seek to look any further into the mystery which it involves. But for the purposes of explanation there are some things to be said that seem to us not unimportant.

The sin that is in our nature is not there by reason of any personal volition of our own. Whether we will it or do not will it, we are born in sin and are therefore children of wrath by nature. Since the fall no one has become a sinner by reason of his personally willing unrighteonsness. All are such independently of any acts of the will. Sin is innate and inheres in our nature. It is there before any

acts of the child reveal it to others; nay, even before it presents itself to the child's own consciousness. It underlies all activities, not only as these become manifest in the external world, but also as these are purely inward products of soul life. Our thinking and feeling and willing are corrupted by it as well as our talking and handling and walking. Not only is our personal life sinful, but it is so because the nature which forms its basis is sinful. By that nature the limits of the individual's moral development are determined. We cannot will, as we cannot put forth activities in another form, outside of those forces in our nature which move to action. When that which is good is brought before the soul, hostility is aroused because it is incompatible with that in us which is bad. The imaginations of the thoughts of man's heart are only evil continually, and all that is good will therefore be resisted as a necessary consequence of man's natural condition. The sin in our nature is repugnant to all holiness. And that sin does not become damnable only when it becomes a matter of consciousness. Personality does not begin only when consciousness begins and reach only as far as consciousness reaches. The child is a person as soon as it is a child, and is a damnable person because it has sinful human nature and is thus a sinful person. In exact accord with the Scriptures our churches "teach that after Adam's fall all men begotten after the common course of nature are born with sin; that is, without the fear of God, without trust in Him, and with fleshly appetite; and that this disease, or original fault, is truly sin, condemning and bringing eternal death now also upon all that are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit."*

*Augsb. Conf. Art. II.

Now as our nature, not only an individual person, fell in Adam's fall, so for the restoration of our race our nature, not an individual person, was assumed by the Son of God, that in Him all righteousness might be fulfilled for all men. "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Rom. 5, 18. 19. We have share in the death and condemnation by natural generation; we have share in the life and justification by spiritual regeneration. Of the first we indeed become partakers without our will, and the misinterpretation of that fact leads many to regard the ways of God as unequal. But it must be observed that although our participation in Adam's sin was not the result of any personal volition on our part, it was not in any sense against our will. With the origin of our personal life the will could have nothing to do, and that life, since the dreadful catastrophe in Eden, by which our nature became corrupt, could not be human without being sinful. Furthermore, it must be taken into account that God in His infinite mercy, before the foundation of the world, formed the plan by which salvation should be secured to the fallen race, so that no soul is hopelessly doomed to death. The Scriptures nowhere teach that all men must perish, whether they will or not, or that all men must be saved, whether they will or not. They know nothing of such a treatment, by which the God who made intelligent creatures would ignore their essential qualities and despise the work of His hands. They know nothing of coercion in spiritual things. God forces no part of the human race, just as little as He does

the whole, in matters pertaining to their salvation. It is not true that some men absolutely must perish, and that others cannot; it is not true that some men absolutely must be saved, and others cannot be. That, under the gracious provision which God has made for man's rescue, is a matter of will, and God does not coerce the will. A will coerced is no will at all. The essence of the corruption is wiped out when action forced by foreign power is predicated of it. Man can only resist the good, when this is presented, but he does this freely under the influence of impulses lying within the soul of him who wills to resist. But there are no other forces in the soul than those which are leagued with evil and which therefore resist all influences of righteousness. How then can there be any other impulses given to the will, unless it be by force? The answer is that God comes by the Gospel to the soul with other powers than those lying in our corrupt nature, and that the will can be moved by these as freely as by the impulses emanating from our nature in its deep depravity. Our birth in sin was inevitable. In the nature of the case the will could not come into consideration here, and therefore all questions about the resistibility of the corruption at its entrance into our personal life are irrelevant. The redemption also is a fact in regard to which our wills were not consulted, as it is independent of individuals and their relation to the blessing secured. Our participation in this blessing is so far inevitable as the first gift of grace takes place without the action of our wills for or against it. The introduction of the light which makes saving grace known to us is accompanied by the power which is needed as a motive to the will. We can refuse to hear the Word, but we cannot prevent that Word, when we do hear it, from ex-

erting some influence upon us. The truth which it conveys may be resisted, but it cannot be consciously resisted without having come to the mind as an object so far known as consciously to arouse our nature's repugnance. No doubt there is an instinctive repugnance between the sin of man and the righteousness of God, even where neither is properly understood by the human intelligence and where there is, strictly speaking, no formal action of the specific faculty called the will. The infant is a sinner and as such a child of wrath by nature. Hence every act of its will must partake of the evil which belongs to its nature as a human person. But in its infantile condition, before it is awakened to any consciousness of the moral quality of its acts, it cannot be said to sin wilfully. It lies in sin; it is a sinner; so far as its acts are not merely spontaneous, but acts of an intelligent person, they are willed, and thus it wills that which is sinful. Its sinful nature asserts itself in sinful actions through the will. But not every act that is willed is wilful. The latter implies the intelligence which distinguishes between two objects or two acts pertaining to the same object, the power of choosing between the alternatives, and the determination to persist at all hazards in the choice made. Such wilful resistance to the saving grace offered to the sinner is not possible where the object has not been brought before the intelligence and where the power of choice does not exist or has not been brought into requisition. It is manifestly absurd to speak of doing wilfully what one has done ignorantly or has not intelligently chosen to do. When grace is brought to children, they resist. Their nature is hostile to it, and with such a nature they cannot otherwise than resist. There is no absolute necessity for this, but there is a necessity growing out of

the condition of the soul. There is no coercion from without, but an impulse within that inevitably produces the sad result. But their resistance is not the result of intelligence and choice. It is the impulse of nature which has not yet settled into a pertinacious determination of the personal will. Two forces, that of nature and that of grace, are thus brought to bear upon the will. One of these lies in the subject itself, and will unquestionably, if nothing is done from without to prevent it, carry the will with it and control its action in every case, and that continually. But here there is a power of grace introduced from without. What the result is has never been a matter of dispute in the Lutheran Church. Regeneration always ensues; that is, the power of grace uniformly, in the case of infants, overcomes the power of sin in our nature. The reason of the Church's unanimity in thus believing and teaching is found in the Scripture assurances of the divine will that all should be saved. So far as it depends upon God's will and work all will certainly be born again when the means of grace are employed. The only obstacle in the way is the power of choice in the human will. The sin in our nature, and the consequent repugnance to saving grace, is not in itself an insurmountable obstacle. God can overcome this without doing violence to His unhappy creature. But the will cannot be carried along by irresistible power and still remain will. It must be directed by motives, which are not irresistible. God can thus move the will by His grace; He need not crush it by His power. Where wilful resistance sets in, that is, where the contents of God's Word are known and the choice is made to reject the proffered salvation, the will's determination being absolutely fixed against the offer of pardon and life, God cannot save the soul with-

out employing His almighty power to crush its will power and thus to destroy its specific nature as a human soul. This He will not do; this He cannot do without coming in conflict with His creative purpose and plan. But in the child there is no such wilful resistance, and consequently all baptized children are regenerated. The grace introduced moves the will to accept the grace, notwithstanding all the impulses in nature to reject it, and under the influence of this moving power the resistance in nature becomes less while grace is increased, and thus sanctification goes daily forward. Only when, under the influence of sinful nature still remaining, there is a conscious opposition to the new forces introduced, so that the personality asserts itself against the power of grace, does the Holy Spirit withdraw and the fall ensue.

But how is it with adults? Some account must be taken, in answering this question, of the difference between those who were regenerated in infancy and those who are influenced for the first time through the preaching of the Gospel. The former, if they have not fallen from grace, are in the same spiritual condition as those who are converted by hearing the Gospel. They have a new heart, and are therefore able, notwithstanding that the flesh in them lusteth against the spirit, to accept the grace offered. With them the supernatural work has been begun, and their case does not therefore come into consideration when we examine into the powers of nature. "There is a great difference," says our Formula of Concord justly," between baptized and unbaptized men. For since, according to the doctrine of St. Paul (Gal. 3, 27), all who have been baptized have put on Christ and thus are truly regenerate, they have now a liberated will, i. e. as Christ says, they

have been made free again (John 8, 36); for this reason they afterward not only hear the Word, but also, although in great weakness, are able to assent to it and accept it."* This the natural man cannot do. How does the grace of God accomplish its purpose in the adult who hears the Gospel, but who, when the truth is presented for his acceptance, is yet in his natural condition of inability?

We have seen that there can be no introduction into the soul of the light of the Gospel without the introduction of the divine energy which is always associated with it. The Gospel not only reveals the righteousness of God, but it is at the same time the power of God unto salvation. Rom. 1, 16. 17. It sets before the soul the acquired righteousness of our Savior as the proper object of faith, and works the faith which apprehends that righteousness. To that which the Gospel exhibits the natural man is hostile. There is an incompatability between the two, so that when the Holy Spirit brings the truth in Jesus it seems foolishness to the carnal mind, and when the power of God is exerted nature resists. But that resistance cannot be wilful as long as the object against which the resistance is made is not presented to the intelligence. The carnal mind is at enmity with God even before that enmity asserts itself in the personal consciousness. The new born child has the carnal mind, and that is enmity against God. Its sinful nature, aside from any acts of intelligence or will, is in antagonism to the Holy Spirit. But it would be trifling with language to call that a wilful resistance to divine grace. When grace comes by the Gospel, the nature of the adult blindly resists, as the nature of the infant blindly resists when grace comes by Baptism. But that

* Part II, chap. 2, § 67.

would no more prevent regeneration in the adult than it does in the infant. The energy of grace is exerted upon the will inevitably, and inevitably does its work, if there is nothing but nature to hinder it. If the power of grace were not sufficient to overcome sinful nature, no soul could be saved. The only possibility of human salvation lies in the power of divine grace. That power suffices. By grace are ye saved. And as with God there is no respect of persons, as His will is the salvation of all, that grace extends to all men alike. God has made provision for the salvation of His fallen creature whose nature is sinful. That provision would be a failure if the mere fact of man's sinfulness and natural hostility to God presented an insurmountable barrier to the work of grace. God has mercifully provided for the salvation of sinners who, because they are sinners, are by nature enemies of God. But what He has not provided for is the salvation of sinners who, when saving grace is brought to them, with resolute wilfulness refuse to be drawn by it to the Savior of the world. Coercion of the soul is no part of His plan. But such wilful resistance to divine grace does not and cannot arise when the intellect has not cognized the object against which resistance is predicated. The soul can be at enmity with God on account of its ungodly state, without knowing God or knowing itself; but it cannot exert that enmity in the intelligence or in the will without having an object before it concerning which its sinful nature moves it to judge adversely and to assert its repugnance. When the Gospel is proclaimed to a man in his natural condition, it is proclaimed to a man whose nature is hostile to its contents and its power. But the proclamation brings something to his intelligence which was not known before, and with the

truth comes a power to move him as he was not moved before. The light that falls into his soul and the first impulse that accompanies the entrance of this light are inseparable from the proclamation which is heard. When there is hearing at all, there is therefore inevitably an impulse given contrary to the impulse of nature. That is sufficient to bring about conversion in due time, and in all cases where nothing else intervenes conversion takes place. That it does not in all cases take place is owing to the fact that in some instances something else does intervene to prevent the result, and that something is the insurmountable obstacle which is called wilful resistance.

The psychological problem that is thus presented is confessedly one of no little difficulty. But the fact is plain, that that which stands in the way of man's conversion, when grace does not accomplish this end, is the individual will. And this other fact is also plain, that there is in the individual who is not converted some obstacle that does not exist in the others, in whom the divine will is accomplished. The difference lies not in God, for His will is the salvation of all. It does not lie in human nature, for that is corrupt and hostile in all. It lies therefore in the personal will, which is different in each individual, as distinguished from the human nature, which is the same in all.

The will is moved by impulses that act as motives. These, as they proceed from the nature of man, are only evil, because that nature is evil. Therefore man cannot by nature rise to volitions that are truly good in the sight of God, or that could effect or aid in effecting his salvation. If there is to be any movement of the will in that direction, the impulse must therefore come from without; in

other words, it must proceed from divine grace, not from human nature. To this end God gives His Holy Spirit through Word and Sacrament. The impulses proceeding from the Holy Spirit are designed to convert the soul, and the appointments of God are adequate to the accomplishment of His ends. He does not drive the will as steam drives the wheels of a machine. The will belongs to man, and man is responsible for his willing. God never treats him as He does the creature that has no intelligence and no moral accountability. He introduces new motive powers, but no coercive forces. When the word of the Gospel comes to man, his nature resists. From this flow impulses upon the will that run counter to those which have been introduced by the Gospel. It is the Holy Spirit of God wrestling with the evil spirit of man. The result will inevitably be the soul's conversion, if there be no further barrier placed in the way than that which exists in our nature and which is therefore in all men alike. If the soul is converted, it is of course wholly and solely by the power of the divine grace operative through the Word: there is no power else by which the change could be wrought. If conversion does not ensue, it is because under the evil influences exerted by corrupt human nature the personal decision was against Christ, though under the influence of grace it might have been for Him. The soul is brought to a decision respecting spiritual things, and this implies that by grace those spiritual things have become the alternatives in the will's choice. God gives the same grace to all by the Gospel, and all set the same depravity against it. In both cases there is an influx of motive powers on the will. But the result is different. Some believe and are saved, some refuse and are lost. Grace would lead all to accept, nature would lead

all to reject Christ. Conflicting motives thus enter the soul and strive for the mastery, the one emanating from the Spirit, the other from the flesh.

It is manifest that a personal decision with reference to the two contending forces must be brought about, and it is equally manifest that neither of these forces acts irresistibly. Grace is not irresistible, for it is charged upon souls that were not led to salvation as a great sin that they "do always resist the Holy Ghost." Acts 7, 51. Nature is not irresistible when grace is offered, else no one could by any possibility be saved. The overcoming of nature by grace cannot be in the case of the adult as it is in the case of the infant, because in the latter the self-conscious exercise of the personal will is not yet possible; in the former, since the Gospel is addressed to the intelligence, it is inevitable. The conquest of nature by grace without making any account of the intelligent action of the soul in regard to the motives at work upon its will, would be ignoring human personality and accountability. It would not be moving the will, as in the case of the regeneration of infants, before the evil nature can assert itself in intelligent choice and wilful resistance to the proffered grace. It would be coercing the will, because the soul, being now in a condition to act intelligently and to exercise judgment in choosing, would not be permitted to put forth its powers, the superior force not only overcoming the evil nature, but precluding all possibility of personal action in accordance with the soul's created nature. When there is intelligent action, as in adults of sound mind, there must be choice, or there could be no more accountability than there is in brutes that are moved by instinct. In our Lord's "ye would not," the ground of the unbeliever's condemnation is expressed with unmistak-

able clearness. That gives us divine certainty on the point, whether we can find a satisfactory psychological explanation of it or not. The fact is plain for our faith, and our philosophy must accept the fact as it is, not set it aside to escape the difficulty. That fact, moreover, commends itself to every man's conscience. The consciousness of guilt always attaches itself to the "would not" which man sets against God's will. When the intelligence is awakened, there can be no conversion without a personal choice between the contending forces of nature and grace. The appeal of the Spirit is always, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve," (Joshua 24, 15) "To-day, if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts." (Heb. 3, 7.) Grace enables us to believe; it does not believe for us and does not force us to believe.

It is a most irreverent proceeding to translate our Lord's words, "Ye *would* not" into "ye could not," casting all the blame of man's rejection of divine grace upon God, and then piously bringing railing accusations against those who make full account of them. What such people desire is that we should concur in their attempts to alter the teachings of Scripture concerning both God and man and to assert that grace works as a physical cause and is therefore irresistible wherever it is brought into operations. It is not a physical force, and never works as such a force. When it is called a cause, it is not meant to say that it is so in a physical sense and that the soul is drawn by it as the log is drawn by oxen. The Spirit moves men, and moves them by persuasives. The Gospel introduces a power indeed which no human motives possess. It is the power of God. But this power does not coerce, and when it is exerted man may resist and many do resist its influence. The conversion is spiritual not physical.

When the Gospel brings to the intelligence of man the truth unto salvation, the power of divine grace which is in it and which in no case is separated from it, acts upon the will of that soul that has given it a hearing. This hearing lies within the power of man as he is by nature. Whether he shall read the Bible or not, whether he shall go to church or not, whether he shall give attention or not to what he reads or hears, are all questions which the soul can decide by considerations and motives which lie outside of the domain of the spiritually good and which require no supernatural gift and power. He can will the right action when that answers the purpose of his sinful nature as well as the wrong, but he cannot will holiness, which is in contradiction to his unholy nature. He can will to be happy, but he cannot will the blessedness which is found in Christ Jesus, whose Gospel is foolishness to his perverted heart and blind understanding. He cannot read the Bible or hear the preaching of the Word with the desire and will to be saved by faith in Christ. Such a desire can be wrought only by the Holy Spirit. He may want to be saved from the misery which he feels, and may go to church because he has heard that there a remedy is offered for the very ills by which he is tormented. And going there he may find the help which he seeks, though he finds it to be of a nature which he did not expect, and may realize a blessing far beyond the hopes which he had entertained. There is much around man and much within him which may prompt him to hear the Gospel before any supernatural power of grace has been exerted upon him. When he has been induced to hear, the hearing itself brings new light and new power. This is the power of divine grace. Faith, which is the gift of God, comes by hearing. The first effects of this hearing are in-

evitable. Man by his natural power comes to hear, and God by His supernatural power through the Gospel acts upon the hearer. But the inevitable grace, it must be remembered, is not irresistible. When the first impulses come upon the will from without, they may be rejected, and the work of grace may thus be hindered in its very beginning. Many, when the contents of the Word are set before their minds and the impulse of grace is experienced in the heart, do set themselves against the truth and power which hearing has introduced. Others are led, with light and power increasing as the hearing continues, notwithstanding the counteracting impulses proceeding from their evil nature, to faith in Jesus as their Savior and to final salvation through His name. At every stage and step, from the inevitable beginning until the ultimate goal is reached in glory, it is a work of God's grace which man may resist.

So far as conversion is spoken of in reference to adults, who must either accept or reject the gracious call brought to their consciousness by the Gospel, it is beyond dispute that it involves a decision. For that decision man is responsible. He is forced neither way. When he accepts Christ, he does so by the supernatural power of grace which the Word conveys. There is no power in nature that could produce this result. But that supernatural power does not produce a physical change which substitutes for an unbelieving soul one that is believing. If that were the case, all hearers of the Gospel would be thus inevitably changed. It comes as a motive that may be resisted, and therefore those who resist are justly condemned, because they would not come when the Lord called.

So far were the authors of our Formula of Concord from admitting that man has no responsibility at all in the mat-

ter of his conversion, and that who shall be converted and who not is arbitrarily decided by the divine will, that they denounced such abuse of the doctrine of human inability as contrary to God and the Gospel, and set forth against it the doctrine of the means of grace as taught in Holy Scripture. Calvinists could not accept this doctrine, and all predestinarians deceive themselves when they think that they can and do accept it; for if the means appointed to convey grace are accepted as divine means through which it is really conveyed, so that in all cases where these are used the grace is offered, the use of the means insures the communication of grace. If God selects individuals in whom He will work conversion unto salvation, either He will offer the means only to these, or the means will have converting power only in these select persons. Either then He designs to save all to whom the means are brought, or the means have saving efficacy only in the case of those persons whom He designs to save. Our Confession urges that the means are efficacious in all cases, and that the fault, if any are not saved, must therefore be with the men who resist the proffered grace, not with God who calls and would convert and save them. It always assumes that the influences exerted on the will are resistible. "This doctrine," it says, "concerning the inability and wickedness of our natural free will, and concerning our conversion and regeneration, viz. that it is a work of God alone and not of our powers, is impiously abused both by enthusiasts and Epicureans; and by their speeches many persons have become disorderly and irregular, and in all the Christian exercises of prayer, reading and devout meditation have become idle and indolent, as they say that, because from their own natural powers they are unable to convert themselves to God; they

will always strive with all their might against God, or wait until God violently converts them against their will; or because they can do nothing in these spiritual things, but everything is of the operation of the Holy Ghost, they will neither hear nor read the Word nor use the sacrament, but wait until God, without means, infuses from heaven His gifts, so that they can truly, in themselves, feel and perceive that God has converted them. Other desponding hearts [our godly doctrine concerning the free will not being rightly understood] might perhaps fall into hard thoughts and perilous doubt as to whether God have elected them and through the Holy Ghost will work also in them His gifts, especially when they are sensible of no strong, burning faith and sincere obedience, but only of weakness, fear and misery. For this reason we will now relate still further from God's Word how man is converted to God, how and through what means (namely, through the real Word and the holy Sacraments) the Holy Ghost is efficacious in us and is willing to work and bestow, in our hearts, true repentance, faith and new spiritual power and ability for good, and how we should act ourselves towards these means and how use them."*

Although man can do nothing to convert himself, but conversion is wholly and solely the work of God, yet God employs certain means for this purpose, without which no one is converted. Hence our Confession, after showing that the Gospel is used and is efficacious to this end, continues: "This preaching [of God's Word] all who wish to be saved ought to hear. For the preaching and hearing of God's Word are instruments of the Holy Ghost by, with, and through which He desires to work efficaciously, and to

*Sol. Decl. Art. 2, §§46–48.

convert men to God, and to work in them both to will and to do. This Word man can externally hear and read, even though he be not yet converted to God and regenerated for in these external things, as above said, man ever since the fall has to a certain extent a free will, so that he can go to church and hear or not hear the sermon. Through this means, namely the preaching and hearing of His Word, God works, and breaks our hearts, and draws man, so that through the preaching of the law he sees his sins and God's wrath, and experiences in his heart true terrors, repentance and sorrow, and, through the preaching and consideration of the holy Gospel concerning the gracious forgiveness of sins in Christ, a spark of faith is kindled in him which accepts the forgiveness of sin for Christ's sake, and comforts itself with the promise of the Gospel, and thus the Holy Ghost, who works all this, is given to the heart. (Gal. 4, 6.)*

On this hearing of the Gospel, which the Holy Spirit uses as His means, the work of conversion will depend, and this hearing, at least as far as the external action is concerned, lies in man's power and depends upon man's will. As God works by the Word, the right use of this means will result in conversion. "Neither preacher nor hearer should doubt this grace and efficacy of the Holy Ghost, but should be certain, if the Word of God is preached purely and clearly, according to the command and will of God, and men listen attentively and earnestly, and meditate upon it, that God is certainly present with His grace, and grants, as has been said, what man can otherwise from his own powers neither accept nor give." †

And this grace is not limited to certain specially

* Sol. Dec. 2, § 52–54. † Ib. § 55.

favored persons; but as Christ has died for all men, so God desires that all men should share the benefits of the redemption through His blood. "For Christ, in whom we are chosen, offers to all men His grace in Word and holy Sacraments, and wishes earnestly that the Word be heard, and has promised that where two or three are gathered together in His name, and are occupied with His holy Word, He will be in their midst." ‡ And as God earnestly desires to save all and has made this means effectual to this end, so that whosoever will may come, it is certainly man's own fault if he is not converted and saved. Where such a man despises the instrument of the Holy Ghost, and will not hear, no injustice befalls him if the Holy Ghost do not enlighten him, but he be allowed to remain in the darkness of his unbelief and to perish; for of this it is written, Matt. 23, 37: 'How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not.'" *

Our Confession thus holds fast the Bible truth that man can do nothing to save himself, but that salvation is wholly the gift of God's grace, and yet keeps as clear of Calvinistic as of Pelagian errors. Man cannot convert himself, but he can prevent the divine work of conversion, and is responsible for such prevention. That his nature resists divine grace and cannot do otherwise than resist is fully recognized and distinctly asserted. But this does not require us to assume that when any person is converted God must have imparted a special grace to overcome such resistance, and that this special grace is imparted only to a select few. There is no respect of persons with God. He desires the salvation of all alike. When the Word is preached in

‡ Ib. § 57. * Ib. § 58.

the churches of this city, the grace dispensed through it is as much for those who refuse as for those who choose to go and hear it. There is no change of heart, there are no spiritual powers necessary to enable a person to go and hear it or to take the Bible and read it. And the reasons offered why people should hear and read it are as valid for one man as for the other. That no one in his natural condition will resort to it for the purpose of embracing the salvation which Christ has secured and which the Gospel offers, is manifest. Of that he either knows nothing, or he will regard it as foolishness and be hostile to it. But souls are not at rest, and it is reasonable that they should hear when they are told that there is one who invites them to come and find rest. They may wilfully resist the inducements which are offered there to hear and read, or they may omit such resistance. Such wilful resistance to the claims of reason is not a necessity of our nature, and the obstruction from such wilful resistance requires no power that is not contained in man's nature. If one will not hear, the fault is his own that he remains in spiritual blindness and death.

But if a person hear or read the Word, whether induced to do this by lower motives of curiosity and business, or by higher motives of morality and mental peace, is he then certain to be converted? Does that wilful resistance which forecloses the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in them, pertain merely to the mechanical motion of going to church, so that the sound may strike the ear, or to the opening of the Bible, so that the page may strike the eye? Evidently there are people who go to church and still are not converted, and evidently there may be and often is a wilful resistance even when the sound of the Gospel reaches the ear. The words of our Con-

fession which show that the reason why few are chosen though many are called is not the unwillingness of God to save them all, but the unwillingness of many to hear the Word by which He would save them, are such as to imply more than a mere refusal to go to church or open the Bible. "The reason is that they either do not at all hear God's Word, but wilfully despise it, close their ears and harden their hearts, and in this manner foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in them; or, when it is heard, they consider it of no account, and do not heed it."*

While some refuse to come within the sound of the Word at all, others, when it comes to their ears, refuse to give it that attention which is necessary for the intellectual apprehension of the message delivered in their hearing. They wilfully decline to give audience to that which they have reason to regard as important for their welfare, even if they are yet unable to discern the nature of the blessing which it offers, or to understand how it could or would supply the want which they feel. Such persistent refusal to give attention, by which they exclude themselves from the blessing which the Word is designed to bring to every hearer, is again not a necessity of our nature, and men may refrain from it, as many do refrain from it, without possessing any other powers than those of nature. They have no excuse for closing their ears against the Word of God, and they need no more power to refrain from such wilfulness than they need for abstaining from an obstinate refusal to hear any other proclamation that claims to be of importance for their welfare. They are not converted, not because God did not desire to convert them, and not because the power

* F. C. Epit. 11, § 12.

was not in the Word to effect their conversion, but because they wilfully would not hear. The Word will always effect its converting and saving purpose when it "is preached purely and clearly, according to the command and will of God, if men will listen attentively and earnestly, and meditate upon it." If man could not by his natural powers refrain from wilful resistance to the approach of the Word to his ears and understanding, there would be no possibility of reaching any soul in adult years except those that have in infancy received the Holy Ghost by Baptism, as in these alone there could be any other power than that which nature possesses.

But even when the Word is heard and the words are listened to so as to be understood, conversion may still not take place. There may be wilful resistance to the truth which is conveyed to the mind. When a person hears the Word of God he must obtain some cognition of that which the Word declares. He can no more avoid this than he can avoid getting some knowledge of a foreign country when he listens to a description of its products and people. Cognitions are necessary when the objects are placed before the mind. But whilst it is not a matter of choice whether we shall see when our eyes are open and thus receive mental impressions, knowledge being thus to some extent inevitable, it is a matter of choice whether we shall turn our eyes in the direction of any given object, whether we shall not close our eyes against it when it is in the range of our vision, or whether we shall give it further attention and make it an object of contemplation when it has impressed itself upon the mind and become an indistinct cognition. Even in the sphere of nature there is much thrust upon us that we have no desire to know, and we wilfully resist the

influence which the knowledge inevitably obtained would exert upon us. We refuse to give it further attention, and thus banish it from the mind. There are some things that we do not want to learn. But we must obtain some knowledge of them before we can know them to be disagreeable, and when we have so far become acquainted with them we may, seeing that heeding them would be conducive to our welfare, overcome the repugnance which we feel towards them and give them the attention which may result in loving them. There is many a subject of study which the youth dislikes when it is first brought to his notice, and which he becomes better acquainted with only by dint of severe struggles against his disinclination to grapple with it, but which he pursues with delight when his first repugnance has been overcome by force of will. This is the case not only when there is a conflict with the love of ease, as when a subject is repulsive because of the difficulties which it at first presents to the mind, but also when there is that in the matter itself which conflicts with our tastes. If the love of ease is overcome, the mind finds pleasure in mastering difficulties and in the acquirements which it cost something to attain. But even where the matter itself was distasteful, as when a life of civil virtue is urged upon the sensualist, the repugnance may be overcome by considerations of expediency or of conscience, and attention be given to the disagreeable subject until it has exerted such an influence upon the soul as to render it agreeable. In other words, tastes may be cultivated, and what was once offensive may in course of time become pleasant. That such cultivation can take place only where the repugnance to the higher and better is suppressed by force of will until the superior objects can exert their power upon the mind and bring about a

change, is plain to all who have given attention to the subject. Now, although the communication made by the Word of God lies upon a higher plane the procedure of introducing it into the mind is analogous. In the nature of the case it must be so. The contents of that Word must enter the soul in order to accomplish its end. As there is a repugnance to those contents, there is no possibility of bringing their influence to bear on the soul, so that a change may be brought about in its condition of antipathy, but by suppressing the natural feeling of repugnance through the supernatural power of grace, which, if not wilfully resisted, will do its saving work. If people can be induced to hear the Word and give it the attention which all communications to the mind require in order to exert their influence, conversion may take place by the supernatural power inherent in the Word. But experience shows that this is not a necessary result. It may fail, and in many cases it does fail to take place. When by the powers of nature wilful resistance to the external hearing and intellectual apprehension of the Word has been overcome, there is still a resistance, and that resistance may be wilful, to the contents of that Word. The light comes to convince the judgment, but brings that which, although it professes to supply what the soul needs, offends natural pride, and many therefore reject it, and choose death.

"When it is heard," our Confession says of those who are not converted, "they consider it of no account and do not heed it." When the law is preached, it appeals to the moral nature of man, which, notwithstanding the repugnance of the sinful heart to all that is good, consents to the law that it is right and salutary. In virtue of the human conscience this is inevitable. Those who rebel against this,

do so indeed in virtue of their natural inclinations, but they do so against the testimony of their own conscience, with a resistance that is not necessitated by their nature, but that may be suppressed by the power of will. Of course this does not make men righteous. Sinful man cannot fulfill the law even when he is led by the Spirit of God, the flesh even then lusting against the Spirit; much less can he do so in his natural state of corruption. But he can see the unreasonableness of resisting the appeal to his conscience, which sanctions the right, though the heart is averse to it, and though he can never by this alone come to a true knowledge of his guilt. So strong is this appeal to the moral nature of man that it leads him to pretend conformity to the demands of the law or to fall into despair on account of his perceived non-conformity. Now, when the law is preached he may, under the influence of his wicked nature, resist its instruction respecting righteousness and refuse to hear and heed its admonitions respecting the demands of holiness. But he does so, as long as obduracy has not set in, against the expostulations and protests of his own conscience. He resists wilfully. He knows better. He repudiates a claim that his understanding can recognize as just and the rejection of which it can see to be injurious to his own welfare. Such resistance is not a necessity of his nature. This is unholy and therefore is repugnant to all holiness. It has such repugnance even after conversion. But the soul is not on that account incapable of all moral perception and impulse. Even by nature there can be moral differences between men, and heathendom has shown such moral differences in the personal characters which it presents. When the law is preached the soul is not constrained by the necessity of its corrupt nature to refuse attention to its holy demands. It

may resist, but it resists against the better light which it possesses, and it may, under the influence of conscience, suppress such resistance. Human nature can still approve the right and resolve outwardly to do it, though the heart be against it.

But when the Gospel is preached, all seems different. There is in our nature seemingly nothing to which this could appeal. It sets before the mind, in opposition to the death of sin, the truth in Jesus which gives life and salvation. How then could men, when it is brought to their intelligence, otherwise than choose death, seeing that the carnal mind, which is the natural mind, is enmity against God? The answer is that with the Word which sets the new spiritual object before the soul comes the new spiritual ability also, so that just in proportion to the intellectual apprehension is the power to recognize and appreciate the truth. The light that shines by the Gospel opens the eye to behold it. Not that every one who hears the Gospel is necessarily so enlightened as to see Jesus and embrace Him as the Savior. Conversion does not at once follow the first operation of the Spirit upon the soul. That first operation is inevitable, but it is not irresistible. When the Spirit by the inevitable operation of the Word has opened the eye to discern, though but dimly and imperfectly, the spiritual object, the way is prepared for further illumination and ultimate conversion. To him that hath shall be given. But conversion is not a necessary consequence; in other words, converting grace is not irresistible. When the eye is partially opened by the light of the Gospel, man may resolve to close it again, instead of letting the work go forward until Christ is seen as the Savior and heartily embraced. Whatever is done, at any and every step of the process by which

the soul is converted, is the work of the Holy Spirit; but at any stage and step the soul may resist His operations and undo the work of grace. "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Phil. 2, 13. But in no case does He force His grace upon us. The employment of force, in opposition to the specific value and design of a creature, is satanic rather than divine. The devil would force us into hell if he could, but he cannot, God could force us into heaven if He would, but he will not. The devil cannot compass his tyrannical purpose, because God protects His creature; God will not use coercion even to secure the soul's happiness, because that would cross His creative purpose, according to which man was made an intelligent being with a will of his own. To ignore this or to override it by the exercise of irresistible power would be to cross God's own plan as manifested in the creation of intelligence and to tyrannize over souls, even though that tyranny should result in the greater happiness of a creature, which, strictly speaking, would be annihilated and for which another essentially different creature would be substituted in the process. Man could not be man if he were made a mere puppet played by almighty power. Being man he has power to resist even the beneficient will of his Maker and Redeemer; and although God does everything for his happiness that can be done without destroying essential powers of his soul, many persistently resist divine grace offered for their salvation and are lost by the choice of their own will.

We know that the problem is not thus solved. On the contrary, we regard it as incapable of solution. But the considerations presented may assist earnest students in locating the difficulty and guarding them against errors

that would dishonor God and injure souls. It is evident that the Lord of all the earth has not, by a decree of mercy to some and not to others, provided for the salvation of a comparatively small number of His lost and helpless creatures, while He left the rest to perish in their sins and doomed them to everlasting misery. It is evident that what He could do to save them all, without destroying the very nature with which in creating He had endowed mankind, He did and continues to do. It is evident that this plan and work of our merciful God is sufficient for the salvation of all to whom the Gospel comes, and that when any are lost notwithstanding all, it is not because the saving power was withheld from the means of grace, but because they "would not." The fault is wholly man's, not only in the sense that man has sinned and merited everlasting death; that applies to all, to the saved as well as to the damned, but in the sense that when the salvation offered and the power of God came to them, they "would not" be brought to Christ, which applies only to those who stubbornly resist the proffered grace. So far the Scriptures make all clear, and any attempt to mystify the matter is in the interest of error. But why one soul wilfully resists the Gospel grace and another does not, though the same sinful nature is in all and the same grace offered to all—that remains the mystery. L.

CONCERNING ARTICLES OF FAITH.

Translated from Hollaz Examen, Prolegomena, by G. H. S.

Question 12. What is an Article of Faith?

An article of faith is a portion of doctrine, revealed in the written word of God, concerning God and divine things,

offered to the sinner in order to be believed, so that he may be saved.

Observation 1. The word article is taken from *artus*, and this from the verb *arcere*, to join. Properly it denotes the members of a body closely united, as e. g. the parts of the fingers are closely connected. Metaphorically the word "article" is applied to parts of doctrines of faith that are joined by a close connection.

Obs. 2. By faith is here meant the "faith which is believed" (fides *quae* creditus), i. e. the doctrines of faith, but with respect to the faith by which we believe (fides *quae* creditur), i. e. the faith which is founded upon the merits of Christ.

Question 13. In how many ways is an article of faith taken?

An article of faith is taken either collectively or distributively. Collectively it denotes a complete topic of Christian doctrine; distributively it denotes any assertion or statement whatsoever, which constitutes a portion of Christian doctrine.

Proof: The doctrines of Christianity are divided into heads or theological *loci*, and the heads are subdivided into certain theses. Both the heads of the doctrine of faith as also the theses under the heads are called articles of faith, e. g. the theological *locus* concerning Christ is called an article of faith, and the statement "Christ in the flesh is sitting at the right hand of the Father," is also called an article of faith.

Quest. 14. What are the requisites of the articles of faith?

For a true article of faith there is necessary, *a*) that it be revealed in the written word of God; *b*) that it pertain

to the salvation of man; *c*) that it be closely connected with the other articles of faith; *d*) that it be beyond natural knowledge (inevidens).

a) A true article of faith is called that which is in harmony with the divine revelation, which we now have in the sacred Scriptures; if namely it is found in them plainly stated or else is drawn from them by an irrefutable conclusion.

b) Every genuine article of faith pertains to the eternal salvation of men, either directly, in so far as it explains the principles and means of salvation, or indirectly in so far as it is a dogma removing an impediment to salvation, so that we lose not the hope of eternal life. For each and every article of faith has not the same importance for eternal salvation, but some bear a close relation to salvation, others remote.

c) The agreement among the articles of faith is a close one, and as it were, a sweet harmony. Hence faith is often said to be one united whole and is compared with a chain consisting of a number of links. Take away a link, and you break the chain; remove one article of faith, and you disturb the harmony of faith. On account of this harmony it is not possible for one article of faith to stand in contradiction to another.

d) That is called "evident" (in the stricter sense of the word) which can be known by the light of nature or be investigated by it; that is called "non-evident" which can be known or understood, not by the light of nature, but by the supernatural light of divine revelation. On the basis of these statements, we must assert that certain articles of faith are non-evident with regard to the material and formal

object, and others are non-evident only with regard to the formal object.

Quest. 15. What is the object of the articles of faith?

The object of the articles of faith are the things to be believed (τὰ πιστ τὰ, credenda). But the things to be believed are God and divine things in so far as these are divinely revealed for the salvation of men.

Obs. From this it is evident that the material object of faith are God and divine things, of which object the formal is the supernatural revelation divinely made and directed to the welfare of man.

Qust. 16. How are the articles of faith divided? The articles of faith in regard to their object are divided into pure and mixed, in regard to condition (habitude) or relation to the foundation of faith and salvation they are divided into fundamental and non-fundamental.

Quest. 17. Which articles of faith are pure and which are mixed.

Mixed articles of faith are called parts of Christian doctrine concerning those divine things which to a certain degree may be known from the light of nature, as well as be believed from the supernatural light of revelation (*a*); pure articles of faith are parts of Christian doctrine concerning divine mysteries superior to and beyond human reason when left to itself, but yet divinely revealed (*b*).

a) Such parts of Christian doctrine as those concerning the existence, the power, the goodness of God, also the articles concerning the creation, preservation and government of the earth are true articles of faith. This is something which we learn not only from the first article of the Apostolic creed, but also from the testimony of Paul. Heb. 11, 6. "And without faith it is impossible to be well-

pleasing (unto God); for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that seek after him." No one worships God with a true faith, no one approaches Him filled with confidence, except he believes that there is an eternal, omnipotent, omniscient Divine Being, and that He cares for the affairs of man, so that He is willing to give all the best things to those who worship Him. Nevertheless also by the light of nature, the existence, omnipotence and providential care of God is known, as Paul testifies, Rom. 1, 19; Acts 14, 17; 17, 24. On this ground it is that some authors have taken occasion to divide the articles of faith into pure and mixed.

You say: There are no mixed articles of faith, because it is not allowed us to mix the things known by nature with the things known supernaturally, as it is not at all proper for us to mix that which is above with that which is below, heaven with earth. Answer: The distinction between pure and mixed articles of faith must be rightly understood. For no article of faith formally considered, in so far as it is an article of faith, is mixed, since all articles of faith depend upon divine revelation, and with respect to the formal object are non-evident. But they are divided into pure and mixed with respect to the material object. Namely, those divine things which are expressed by what we call mixed articles of faith, are known partly from reason and partly from divine revelation. They are known, I say, from the principles of reason—less well, less safely and fully; but from the revealed Word they are known much better, more certain and fuller for the salvation of man. Add also this, that certain matters, connected with these that are knowable from both sources, are purely matters of fact and revelation. As an example of this take the creation of the world within the space of six days. Not without reason the Apostle says, Heb. 11, 3: "By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the Word of God."

b) Pure articles of faith are occupied in explaining the mysteries of faith transcending the capacity of reason when

left to itself. The word mystery is from the verb μύειν, which means to close the eyes, to close the mouth, and consequently to keep silent. From μύειν is derived μύέειν, which signifies to imbue a person with an honest doctrine. The middle voice means, to initiate into sacred things. The noun μύστης signifies one who is initiated into sacred things, who either silently listens to others and learns of sacred things, or who has been filled with the knowledge of sacred things, as that he teaches them and is to be heard with reverent silence. Cf. Phosphor. Cranseri p. 906: The word, μυστήριον which like μύστηρ is derived from μύειν which used by profane authors signifies all secret things which dare not be spoken out boldly, or it denotes especially the services of Ceres celebrated in deep silence. In sacred literature μυστήρια denote divine and supernatural things which are unknown to reason when left to itself, but which have been divinely revealed to us for our salvation. For which reason the incarnation of Christ is universally called "the great mystery." 1 Tim. 3, 16; also the spiritual union of Christ with the Church, Eph. 5, 32; the calling of the Gentiles, Eph. 3, 3; the conversion of the Jews to faith in Christ, Rom. 11, 25; the transformation of those who shall be alive on the last day, 1 Cor. 15, 51; the final liberation of the Church, Rev. 10, 7, are called mysteries. The Greek fathers use the word mystery in a special sense of the sacraments, over which the sacred heralds are the stewards and dispensers, 1 Cor. 4, 1. Those portions of Christian doctrine which explain these mysteries are called pure articles of faith.

Quest. 18. What articles of faith are fundamental?

Fundamental articles of faith are those parts of Christian doctrine which are so necessary to be known that, in case they are not known, the foundation of faith is not apprehended or retained savingly by man, but if they are denied, it is, as far as he is concerned, overthrown.

Quest. 19. What is the foundation of faith and of salvation?

The foundation of faith is, on the one hand, real or substantial; or, on the other, dogmatical or doctrinal. The sub-

stantial foundation of faith and of salvation is Christ, in so far as He is the meritorious cause of the remission of sin, and eternal life to be obtained from God and promised in the Gospel to all believing in Him, through the efficacious influence of the Holy Spirit. *a*) The dogmatical foundation of faith and eternal life is the complex of doctrines divinely revealed, by which Christ is set forth as the substantial foundation of faith, as also the principles and means of salvation necessarily connected therewith. *b*)

Obs. 1. A foundation belongs to those things that bear a relation to another thing. A foundation bears a relation to the superstructure erected upon it, which it is to uphold. Nic. Hunnius defines the foundation as that which is the first thing in every building and holds up the whole structure, but is held up by no other portion of it. Musaeus defines: The foundation is that which is first in everything, and which is the reason or cause why that which is built upon it exists, or can exist. Hence, here, according to analogy, the foundation of faith and salvation is called that which is the first in justifying faith and in the salvation of man, and is the reason and cause that justifying faith and salvation itself are man's, or can be his.

Obs. 2. Although faith and the salvation of man differ, as two subordinate ends of theology, since faith is for the sake of the salvation of men, yet the foundation of both is the same. For saving faith rests upon that upon which salvation rests, since faith draws from its foundation its saving power, and upon the same (foundation) the salvation of man depends. For this reason we here purposely join continually faith and the salvation of men.

Obs. 3. Some theologians add yet the organic foundation of faith, by which is understood the Sacred Scriptures considered as the fundamental source of our knowledge of the articles of faith. Concerning this see the following chapter.

a) 1 Cor. 3, 11: "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Paul is speaking concerning the foundation of the Church, which

he compares with a well cultivated field and with an elegant building. v. 9. He compares himself with a wise (ministerial) builder, v. 10, but he calls Christ the *foundation* of the building, v. 10. For the whole Church, which is the house of the living God, 1 Tim. 3, 15, is founded upon Christ as upon an immovable rock, so that not even the portals of hell shall prevail against it. Matt. 16, 18. But as the Church is the gathering of men who believe and shall be saved, it is not incorrectly concluded, that Christ is also the foundation of faith and of salvation. For the believers and those who are to be saved are built upon the foundation Christ in so far as they are believers or are to be saved, or which amounts to the same thing, in regard to faith and salvation. St. Peter, Acts 4, 11. 12, agrees with this, when he says: This Jesus of Nazareth is a stone that is rejected by you the builders, and has become the head of the corner. In any other there is no salvation. This is to say: In the structure of salvation, Christ is that first thing out of which salvation springs; for He is the reason and the cause that saving faith, remission of sins and eternal life are or can be.

b) Eph. 2, 20. Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets, of which Jesus Christ is the corner-stone. The discourse of St. Paul is concerning the dogmatical foundation of faith. For by the foundation of the apostles and prophets he means the doctrines delivered by the apostles and prophets, either orally or by means of writing, which doctrines, namely, are the immovable basis upon which the structure of faith and salvation is built and established. On the other hand, the apostle teaches that the corner-stone is Christ, for the purpose of showing that the prophetic and apostolic doctrines are fundamental in this way, that they rest upon Jesus Christ as upon the deepest corner-stone and last foundation, and, strictly speaking, He is the only foundation. For as a corner-stone, joining together two walls, is seen by all and appears very prominently, thus Christ, connecting the prophetic and apostolic doctrine, shines forth conspicuously in them. And besides by an in-

dissoluble connection the mercy of God the Father and the grace of the Holy Spirit hang together with the foundation Christ. For the general and universal mercy of God has established Christ as a foundation. Is. 28, 16; John 3, 16. But the special mercy of God remitting the sins to the believers is founded upon the merits of Christ. That God is able to remit the sins of the transgressors, without detriment to His immutable justice, and promises to remit them to those who believe, all this flows from the merit and satisfaction of Christ that has been furnished for the sins of the whole world. For which reason we who are reconciled to God glory indeed in God, but through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received reconciliation. Rom. 5, 11. In whom all the promises of God are yea and amen. 2 Cor. 1, 20. The applying grace of the Holy Spirit erects upon the foundation Christ the saving faith which through the medium of the Word He gives and confirms. For although the apostle had taught, Eph. 2, 20, that Christ is the corner-stone of the apostolic and prophetic foundation, he, in v. 22, adds: Through whom also we are builded together into a habitation of God in the Spirit. The Apostle means to say: Ye Ephesians, although of Gentile origin, are built up together with us Jews upon Christ as the corner-stone of the whole Christian doctrine, through the efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit, through whom we are converted and regenerated, so that God with His gracious presence dwells within us. From this it results, that the dogmatical foundation of faith is the catalogue, or series, or complex of all those dogmas by which the satisfaction and merit of Christ, the grace of God the Father and the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit are held up to and explained for belief to him who is to be saved.

You say: There is but one foundation of one certain thing. Therefore there is no double foundation, namely, one real and one doctrinal. We answer: The substantial and the dogmatical foundation of faith and of salvation are not two foundations standing over against each other nor differing as to essence, but differing according to our way of

conceiving them on account of the various things connected. Namely, Christ is the foundation as far as fact is concerned; the doctrine concerning Christ is the foundation as far as our cognition is concerned. But the doctrine concerning Christ is nothing else than Christ understood with the intellect and held up to others to be known by them by means of the written or the preached Word. Therefore the dogmatical and the substantial foundation do not differ except as doctrine and object of doctrine, which taken together constitute a single foundation in reality, although our mind conceives it as double. For the one cannot be disjoined from the other, but our faith stands in such a relation to the doctrine concerning Christ, that through this doctrine when believed, it goes to Christ Himself, who is signified and represented through the doctrine, and rests upon Him thus apprehended and believed as upon the last corner stone.

Quest. 20. In what manner are the fundamental articles of faith divided?

Fundamental articles of faith are divided into primary and secondary. The primary articles of faith are those leading portions of Christian doctrine, the clear knowledge of which is so necessary in order to obtain faith and salvation, that, if they are unknown, faith can neither be generated nor preserved, nor can eternal salvation be secured. They are subdivided into articles which constitute faith, which precede it, and which follow it. The articles constituting faith, or the formal articles, are those which reveal the nearest causes of faith and salvation, and thus enter into the very causal definition of saving faith *a*). The antecedent articles of faith are those by which those necessary presuppositions of faith are explained, which are so necessary, that if they are not present, the very foundation of faith does not exist *b*). The consequent articles of faith are those which explain the results of Christian faith, by the presence of which the divinely established faith is confirmed, is preserved, increased and grows, but if they are

not present, the faith that has been enkindled is extinguished and disappears *c*).

a) The causal definition of saving faith can be understood from the following words. Saving faith is the divinely constituted means, by which the sinner, converted and regenerated through the efficacious operation of the Spirit through the medium of the divine Word, accepts the grace of God remitting his sins and founded on Christ and promised in the Gospel, and applies this to himself with an individual trust (*singulari fiducia*), so that he is justified and eternally saved. Whatever articles of faith answer to the given definition of saving faith, are those which are by common consent the formal, or those articles constituting faith. These in regular order we present here, namely 1) The article concerning the divine Trinity, as the efficient cause of faith, righteousness and salvation, although the conferring of the powers of faith is in the Sacred Scriptures attributed to the Holy Spirit, whom Paul calls the Spirit of faith. 2 Cor. 4, 13. 2) The article concerning sin and the sinner, who is namely the remote material cause, in which faith is enkindled. 3) The article concerning the Word of God as the means of grace and of salvation, through the medium of which, the sinner, unless he maliciously resists, is converted and regenerated, as also by it the object of faith is presented. 4) The article concerning the conversion of the sinner, insofar as in the stricter sense it denotes the gracious act of God by which means the will and heart of man in the midst of its state of sin is checked by the Word of the law, is broken and crushed, so that he seriously laments and is sorry of his sin; the immediate effect of which is contrition. The contrite sinner is the nearest subject (*proximum subjectum*) to whom faith is conferred. 5) The article concerning regeneration, which namely is the gracious action of the Holy Spirit, by which on the one hand the power of believing and on the other faith itself is conferred on the contrite sinner. 6) The article concerning the justifying grace of God, the effect of which is the remission of sins and the imputed righteousness of Christ.

7) The article concerning the Mediator Christ, His satisfaction and merit, upon which the justifying grace of God is based. But the justifying grace of God that is founded in Christ and promised in the Gospel, is the object of saving faith. 8) The article concerning saving faith itself, as it is the "receptive organ," or the medium on the part of the converted and regenerated sinner accepting and applying to himself individually the grace of God, the merit of Christ and the Gospel promise with an undoubting confidence, in which trusting acceptation consists the form of faith. 9) The article concerning eternal salvation, as the final and last end of saving faith.

Obs. 1. The articles mentioned as fundamental and constituting articles of faith can be comprehended in the following dogmatical thesis:

God, moved by a strong mercy toward fallen mankind, converts and regenerates all poor sinners, unless they maliciously resist, through the efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit, through the medium of His most efficacious Word, and justifies those regenerated on account of the satisfaction of the Mediator Christ held forth in the Gospel promise and accepted by true faith of the heart and applied to the individual, and He wills eternally to save those who are justified.

Upon this foundation lost man, corrupted through sin, depends, in order to secure remission of sin and eternal salvation, and he argues and concludes in the following manner: I am a most miserable sinner, yet not resisting the operation of the Holy Spirit, so that I rather gladly hear His Word, listen to it devoutly and study it assiduously; I seriously acknowledge the sins I committed, am sorry for them, detest them; I accept and apply to myself individually by means of undoubting confidence, given to me by the Holy Spirit, the grace of God, pardoning sins on account of the satisfaction of Christ and offered in the Gospel promise. Therefore I truly believe that God forgives me my sins, imputes to me the righteousness of Christ and will save me eternally.

The major premise constitutes the foundation itself of faith and salvation. Conscience, illuminated by the Word of God, confirms the minor. The conclusion, resting them upon the foundation of faith and salvation, is most certain.

Obs. 2. Although the articles of faith mentioned above are the most important in regard to the real foundation of faith and salvation, namely the Mediator Christ, yet they do not embrace fully and clearly the whole and complete dogmatical foundation of faith and salvation, but in order to complete it and make it a rounded conception in our minds, there are required also the antecedent and the consequent fundamental articles of faith. This is what we learn from Heb. 6, 1. 2, where the Apostle earnestly says, "Wherefore let us cease to speak of the first principles of Christ and press on unto perfection; not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God, of the teaching of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment." From which words it is clearly seen that the Apostle considers as belonging to the doctrinal foundation of faith not only the divine doctrine concerning faith in God, concerning the conversion of sinners, but also those concerning baptism, concerning the ministry of the Church, concerning the resurrection of the dead, concerning the last judgment.

b) Before a sinner secures justifying faith for the purpose of obtaining eternal salvation, it is necessary that should he learn beforehand certain doctrines divinely revealed for the salvation of man. There must be presupposed 1) Concerning the existence of the highest, most powerful, most wise and true God, the Creator, Preserver and Governor of this universe, the most gracious Rewarder of all the good, and most just Judge of evil. That this must be presupposed is clear from the words of the Apostle, Heb. 11, 6: It is necessary for him who cometh to the Lord to believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that seek after Him. Because if God did not exist there would be no Mediator. For Christ is the Mediator between

God and man. 1 Tim. 2, 5. 2) In order rightly to understand the foul deformity of sin and the misery of the sinner, the image of God must be known, which shone in its splendor in our first parents, and this having been lost through the fall of Adam, how much sin has befouled man. 3) In regard to the Word of God considered as the means of grace and salvation, its divine authority and infallible truth must be presupposed; because if this is not the case, it would not with power overcome the human heart nor penetrate it in order to effect a detestation of sin and to awaken faith in Christ. 4) In order to understand the doctrine of the conversion of the sinner, the export of Christian doctrine treating of the loss of free will in spiritual things must be presupposed, so that the blind and miserable sinner, his inborn and actual wickedness being known, gives himself up entirely to the grace of the Holy Spirit commencing and finishing the conversion. 5) Preceding regeneration comes the call to the Church and to repentance, as also the illumination through the law and the Gospel. 6) Before the justifying grace of God stands the heavenly doctrine concerning the universal benevolence of God, according to which out of pity for the miserable fate of all and every sinner, He has set apart a Mediator, whose satisfaction for the sins of all the world He decided most graciously to accept; and in order that the unfortunate sinner should accept this as his own satisfaction, He is willing to give faith to all those who do not stubbornly resist, and in order to attain this, He has established most efficacious means and has offered them to all men. If this universal mercy of God had not pre-existed, then there would have been no faith in Christ, nor any remission of sin or any eternal salvation. 7) In order to know Christ as the Mediator there is required the doctrine concerning the divinity and the humanity of Christ and the personal union of the two natures in Christ, namely that He is true God and true man, without sin and without the power of sinning; and if He had not existed He would not have been able to expiate through His blood for our sins. But for the satisfaction

and merit of Christ there is immediately presupposed the sufficiency and universality thereof, in so far as the intention of applying the same on God's part is concerned, which is indeed not the most important ingredient of the confidence, but a doctrine forming its immediate foundation just as faith in the divine benevolence is founded on the universality of the latter, from which manifestly the universality of the merit follows. For it is not possible that he who hopes for the grace of God on account of the satisfaction of Christ, should not ask whether this satisfaction is so rich that he himself is able to secure it, whether God wishes that he also should enjoy the fruits of it. But when a person trusts the divine goodness on account of the merit of Christ, it is not necessary that at the same time he should consciously be anxious about the universality and sufficiency, if he only presupposes this firmly and without doubt. 8) The trusting application of the merits of Christ is preceded by the knowledge of Christ and the assent given to the Gospel promise. 9) The sinner believing himself to be an heir to eternal life from the grace of God on account of the satisfaction of Christ apprehended in true faith, presupposes the divine dogmas concerning death, in so far as it is the entrance to eternal life, concerning the resurrection of the dead, and concerning the last judgment. All of which articles of faith show what are the prerequisites of faith and are commonly called the fundamental antecedent articles of faith.

c) By consequent fundamental articles of faith are understood those things to be believed which follow justifying faith, strengthen it, confirm it by experience, help and augment, carry out and declare it. The following are such: 1) The article of faith concerning the Word of God as the means of grace and salvation. For although we have above counted this among the last causes that generate faith, yet its frequent study, contemplation and reading strengthens and increases faith. This the Apostle teaches, 1 Pet. 21: "As new born babes, longing for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation."

The Word of God is not only the seed by which faith is generated, 1 Pet. 1, 23, but also the sincere milk by which it is nourished, increased and strengthened. 2) The article concerning the sacrament of baptism. It might be that a person would consider the doctrine concerning baptism as one of the fundamental articles that constitute faith, because infants are regenerated thereby, John 3, 5, and put on Christ, Gal. 3, 27. But infants feel rather the efficacy of baptism than that they are presupposed to have an idea of the efficacy of baptism. Cf. Kromayer, proaem, p. 9. The baptism of the adults seals and increases the faith drawn from God's Word, since after the manner of circumcision it is to-day the sign of the righteousness by faith, Rom. 4, 11. 3) The article concerning the sacrament of the altar. For this was instituted by the Savior so that the true and real body of Christ taken in and with the bread certifies to each one taking it that this body of which he eats has been given unto death for him, and that the blood which he drinks has been shed for him individually, that by a firm and unflinching trust he may cling to his Savior. 4) Concerning the mystic union of the regenerated soul with God, from which arises the confirmation of faith and its consciousness. Concerning the consciousness of faith, the apostle speaks, 2 Cor. 13, 5: Try your own selves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Or know ye not as to your own selves that Jesus is in you? In whom Jesus Christ dwells with His grace, these know, that they through faith are implanted into Christ, when they try and prove the faith in him by the determination to live a pious life, by the peace of conscience, by the joy within, and the loving hope into which they are regenerated, through the resurrection of Christ from the dead. 1 Pet. 1, 3. But he who proves his faith by a close examination, has the consciousness and experience of this. Concerning the confirmation of faith the same apostle says, 2 Cor. 1, 22: God has sealed us, and given us the earnest of the spirit in our hearts. God, by sending this Holy Spirit into our hearts, confirms faith, righteousness and the hope of the eternal inheritance. 5) Concern-

ing the renewal or sanctification, the efforts of which are good works, through which true faith is shown forth and exhibited; and if these do not follow justifying faith, it disappears and dies. Concerning which the Apostle James admonishes us, c. 2, 18, 20. Show me thy faith from thy works. Wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead. As the presence of good works proves the presence of justifying faith, so its absence naturally is the sign of a dead faith. 6) Concerning the Church. For since Christ is the Head and King of the Church, defending her so that the portals of hell shall not prevail against her, Matt. 16. 18, the confidence of the regenerated is exceedingly strengthened, because they trust that He will defend them as the living members of the Church under the government and direction of Christ, both from the snares of Satan, the allurements of the world, as also from the growling and dominion of the flesh. 7) Concerning the ministry in the Church, the works of which the Holy Spirit uses in order to apply to man the means of grace and salvation. For which reason the Apostle graphically describes the office of the ministry in 1 Cor. 4, 1. "Let a man account of us as of ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God." He who is to be considered and reputed as a minister of God, must by divine faith be regarded as a divine organ, which the Holy Spirit uses in order to excite and to confirm faith in Christ.

Ques. 21. What articles of faith are secondarily fundamental?

The secondarily fundamental articles of faith are those, the simple lack of knowledge of which does not affect salvation, but whose pertinacious denial or contending against destroys the foundation of faith. Such parts of Christian doctrine are those concerning the characteristic properties of the divine persons (*a*); concerning the communication of attributes in Christ (*b*); concerning original sin (*c*); concerning the decree of election in view of final faith (*d*); concerning the justification of the sinner through faith alone, to the exclusion of all merit of good works (*e*); etc.

Obs. 1. The secondarily fundamental articles of faith are not so much complete heads of doctrines (integra capita) as rather their parts and declarations. They are called articles of faith in the distributive sense, in so far as they are doctrines divinely revealed belonging to the foundation of faith and salvation. They merit and retain the name of fundamental articles, because the denial of any article of secondary importance necessarily and always brings with it an error indirectly damaging to the foundation of faith and salvation, and by which, as a result, the foundation itself, or something without which it cannot be safe, is destroyed.

Obs. 2. Although the mere ignorance of the secondarily fundamental articles does not endanger salvation, yet all the teachers of the church and school must contend for this, that beginning Christians should henceforth make greater progress in the knowledge of the saving doctrines. For in this way it will be that they will give fuller and better assent to the primarily fundamental articles of faith, of which the secondarily articles are the declarations.

a) Plain people, who have been made acquainted with the holy truths of Christianity, believe with a simple faith that God is one, who is and is called God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. They believe that God the Father is one, that the Son of God is one, that the Holy Spirit is one, and yet that there are not three Gods, but only one true God, by whom all creatures are, and are preserved and governed. But does it not often happen that they are ignorant of how the person differs from the essence? in what the personality of the Holy Spirit differs from the personality of the Son of God? or what and of what kind is the peculiar and distinguishing character of each? The mere ignorance of these things, in case there is freedom from an opposite error, does not in itself condemn. But if á person persistently denies the eternal generation of the Son from the Father and the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, he does not worship the Son of God and the Holy Spirit with the same religious

cultus with which God the Father is worshiped; or, if with the Isabellians, he confounds the three persons of the Trinity, and as far as he is concerned, he overthrows as a result the fundamental article that God is three in one.

b) The regenerated man with a somewhat dull intellect believes in Jesus Christ as the true God and the true man, as the one Mediator between God and man, but he does not make it plain to his mind how the divine nature communicates its properties to the human nature that has been assumed and appropriates to itself the characteristics of the human nature, and the mere ignorance of this does not prevent his salvation. But if a person would contumaciously oppose the doctrine of the communication of attributes, which results from the personal union of the two natures in Christ, he thereby will contend against the fundamental doctrine of faith concerning the personal union of the two natures.

c) In order to secure faith in Christ there is not absolutely necessary the knowledge of original sin as having descended from Adam to his descendants (for the sinner may acknowledge his own sins, may lament over and detest them, although he may not systematically understand the original fall of man), but this is necessary in order to keep out the contrary opinion, which is the conviction of the perfect sanctity of man and his ability fully to comply with the commands of God. If any person errs in this he cannot arrive at a serious acknowledgment of his sins or at a true contrition. But the proper subject to which living faith is given is a contrite heart.

d) In the Christian congregation you will find simple-minded men who believe that they have attained remission of sin and eternal life from God through undeserved grace on account of the merit of Christ, but who nevertheless never think concerning the eternal decree of election made by God in view of final faith in Christ. The simple ignorance of election does not condemn these, but a malicious denial brings this result: that God does not in time save

men in foresight of a persevering faith in Christ, because the decree and its execution correspond to each other accurately.

e) The justification of the converted sinner through faith in Christ is a constituting fundamental article of faith. But it happens that a sinner acknowledging and detesting his sins, places all his confidence in Christ, the Mediator, unto whose memory the exclusion of good works does not enter. Who would condemn him? But if he denies that the sinner is justified solely by faith in Christ, he impugns the primary fundamental articles of faith concerning the grace of God and the merit of Christ.

Obs. A denial takes place either on the part of a pertinacious character of the seduced, or it arises merely from the ignorance and simplicity of the one seduced. A denial of the first destroys a primary fundamental article, which the ignorance of the second leaves uninjured. The reason is, because the denial of a secondarily fundamental article of faith does not oppose the foundation of faith, except in its consequences. But he who expresses such a denial out of his simplcity does not understand the consequences. Therefore such a denial can stand consistent with the foundation of faith. On the other hand, a pertinacious denial brings with it as a concomitant, an error contrary to the foundation of faith.

Quest. 22. Are all the fundamental articles of faith found verbatim in the Sacred Scriptures?

Certain of the fundamental articles are found in express words in the Sacred Scriptures (*a*). Certain others are contained in the Scriptures by implication and as to the substance only, and are drawn by clear and undeniable deduction from them (*b*).

a) We read it expressly written that there are three who testify in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, and that these three are one, 1 John 5, 7; that Christ is true man, 1 Tim. 2, 5; that He is true God, 1 John 5, 21; the Mediator between God and man, 1 Tim. 2, 5; the only begotten Son of God, John 1, 14; that the Holy Spirit pro-

ceeds from the Father, John 15, 24; that all nations are to be baptized, Matt. 28, 19.

b) By valid inference we conclude that God, one in essence, is three in persons; that God from eternity begat the Son as His equal in essence; that Christ is one person consisting of two natures; that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son; that infants should be baptized, etc.

Quest. 23. What articles of faith are non-fundamental?

Non-fundamental articles of faith are the parts of Christian doctrine which can be unknown or denied without the loss of salvation.

For example, it is certain that some matters divinely revealed can be explained in two ways, e. g. Are the waters placed by God over the firmament the clouds, or are these heavenly waters? Was the earth founded in the spring or in the autumn? Was the first sin of the fallen angels jealousy or pride? Will the future destruction of the earth be as to substance or as to accident? Because if the sinner in seeking eternal salvation should be ignorant of the heavenly waters above, or should deny their existence, he would not lose his hope of eternal salvation, nor would he destroy the foundation of faith, because questions or assertions of this sort do not affect it.

Obs. In these extra-fundamental dogmas we should be careful and not in our rashness embrace error, lest we sin against the very revelation of God. Especially let us teach nothing against our conscience, or so as to lead others astray, and let us not teach anything against a fundamental article of faith.

Quest. 24. Must all the articles of faith be known with an equal degree of necessity?

All the articles of faith must be known but by a different degree of necessity. For those articles which enter into the very definition of saving faith, or which are immediately prerequisites for generating faith, are most of all necessary to be known for the man who is to be saved. (*a*) Of the other articles some are positively and directly, others

negatively and indirectly necessary. (*b*) And if we look at the men who are believers, the same measure of knowledge is not needed by each and every one. (*c*)

a) Those doctrines divinely revealed, by which the nearest causes of saving faith are explained, cannot remain unknown without the loss of eternal salvation, nor denied by any man who is to attain to eternal salvation, because they embrace the dogmatical foundation of faith upon which rests the whole structure of faith and salvation. The most close connection with the foundation of faith those articles have which must be presupposed, as the universal love of God to man and the grace which chose and gave Christ, and is desirous of conferring faith upon all men, as also the universality of the merit of Christ, that the sinner, who is to obtain life eternal from this universality, may draw a conclusion respecting himself and say concerning himself individually: God desires to be merciful to me; He has given me the means that through them faith may be given me, so that I may without hesitancy believe that Christ died for me a miserable sinner; so that I do not resist, but through Him enter eternal life.

b) The rest of the articles of faith are either primary, equally important for the establishment and strengthening of faith, and are such as must be believed positively and directly; or they are secondary, which are negatively and directly necessary to be believed, because their denial, through the consequences thereof, destroys the foundation of faith.

c) The necessity of knowing the articles of faith, it seems, must to some extent be limited by the condition of those who believe, since some of those who are converted are simple minded, others are educated, some infants, others adults; some pupils, others doctors and teachers. Would you ask the same degree of knowledge from the peasant that you are justified in requiring from a literary man? Talents vary since God Himself has given and distributed these unequally, giving one a greater, another a smaller measure. The conditions of life differ, so that a man may now be in a

peaceful state, in which milk suffices him as a nourishment of his faith; now he is in a turbulent state, when, on account of the tyranny of Satan and the poison of heresies, he needs stronger help and more medicine. To this comes that some are converted at the very end of life, while to others there is left a considerable time for living and thinking. To the former the doctrine must be given in a summary manner, so that they may fall asleep in the faith in the Mediator Christ; for the latter it must be better explained and elucidated, so that they may grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. 2 Pet. 3, 18.

Obs. The Sacred Scriptures represent the relation of dogmas to salvation in expressed terms as a necessity of believing them unto salvation, partly implicitly and through the consequences. When the Savior says, John 17, 3, This is eternal life, &c., He expressly declares that the dogma concerning the true God must be believed for eternal life, so that eternal life, that is, the way and manner of obtaining eternal life, consists in believing and knowing this. But implicitly and by consequence the Sacred Scriptures state that some doctrines are necessary for salvation, when they, although they do not reveal them under the expressed necessity that they must be believed, yet declare and express them in such a manner that they hang together by a close connection with the foundation of salvation in Christ, as can be concluded from their closer study and by deduction. For from their consideration it will be clear that they all unite toward faith in Christ and through faith, toward the securing of salvation, as John 20, 31 expressly declares: "These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in His name."

LABOR IN THE LIGHT OF THE BIBLE.

"Viewed from an economical standpoint, human labor is a commodity like any other, the relation between master and workman a contract, in which, with the exchange of two commodities, money and labor, everything is accomplished. The pure science of economy cannot speak otherwise, for it views things only in so far as they represent values." Assuming for a moment this conception to be the correct interpretation of a scientific principle, we are immediately brought face to face with the difficult problem of the law of adjustment of values and the principles underlying the fluctuations of such values, the relation of production and consumption, and a great variety of causes and effects. To the practical economist these questions may present a seductive field for philosophical speculation and theorizing; how far the approximate solution on a scientific basis has been reached, and how salutarily the application of such a solution has reacted on the welfare of mankind, is illustrated by the ever recurring convulsions in the market of the world's labor, which, usually, are finally adjusted through the instrumentality of powder and steel, and at the expense of blood and the wrecks of costly industries.

In the whole scheme two factors of transcendent importance are totally ignored, that the producer of the "value" labor is a conscious agent, moved by impulses, desires, judgment and will, and that this agent with all his faculties is under the sovereignty of a power directed to the accomplishment of all that is evil, enlisting all the baser passions and motives of the subject under its influence, namely the power of sin. Men are not lifeless quantities, which, under the manipulation of the calculator, will, according to specified rules, exhibit definite results; men will never assume arithmetical qualities to such a degree, that their powers can be formulated into unerring equations. True, they will at times, and for a time, under the stress of circumstances sell their productive powers unconditionally

and become a commodity in the market, an object of barter and exchange; they may, for a season, allow certain acts of their will to be purchased under the controlling will of another and thus voluntarily become a cold "value" in the example of the purchaser. But given a change of circumstances, a shifting of the plane of aspirations, the patent influence of example, or the insinuating force of agitation, and this apparently dead and mechanical value will develop a fearful degree of uncontrollable energy.

Taskmasters may, by shrewd contrivances and monopoly, for a time gamble with this assumed value, human labor, unchallenged and successfully; they may apparently reduce this element to the value of figures in their calculations: but that great unknown quantity, the will, ignored or at least undefined in their scheme, must assert itself and affect the result disastrously. "From this root spring forth all those phenomena of modern industry, from the lamentable fact, that a great many manufacturers and workmen view their relation simply as a business contract, that the manufacturer sees in the employe nothing but a tool, to be used as advantageously as possible; the employe on the other hand considers every loss of his abusing employer his own advantage," Mr. Juengst of Cincinnati is moved to exclaim in considering this question.

Every so-called scientific theory, which does not take into account at their true estimate these two factors, the conscious individuality of the working power, and the inherent activity of sin in mankind with its vice-breeding power, its allurements to selfishness, extravagance, dissatisfaction, self-adulation, contempt of authority and justice, must fall sadly short of a solution of the vexed question and mislead to experiments as utopian as they are futile. In our estimation the true character of labor, and the relation which man must sustain to it can be developed only on the basis of the law which the Creator of man and His powers has established, and by taking into account the changes and dangers which the introduction of sin into the world has caused to arise.

The first record of the relation which the Lord God established for man to sustain to the creation about him is found Gen. 2, 15: "And the Lord God took the man and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it." The scope of the text is plain. The word translated *to dress* is the same as found Exod. 20, 9: "Six days shalt thou *labor*." It is therefore evident, that with all the beneficent gifts and blessings offered by the garden of Eden, it was not God's intention that man should enjoy them in idleness, but that his labor should become the medium of conveying these abundant blessings of God's grace into his possession and of adapting them to his specific requirements. This labor however was not in the nature of irksome toil and harrowing care, since the will of man was in most perfect harmony with the will of God in the exercise of the individual intellectual and physical powers, with which his nature was adorned after the image of God, and the abundant result of his labor supplied him with all the necessities to maintain fully his unimpaired powers. The same object is evinced in the creation of woman as a *help meet* for the man, v. 18, an assistant and companion in his work.

Labor, therefore, in the abstract, without reference to disposition, choice, duty or necessity must be characterized as an *act of obedience to a direct command of the Creator.* It is not a matter of free volition in man to be employed in laboring, or not to be so employed; it ceases to be a subject of choice, whether we should turn our talents and gifts, physical or intellectual, to account in labor appropriate to their functions, or not to do so: the intention of God manifested in the creation of these powers and talents, the direct command to employ them in our interest. the nature of our environments as ordained by the providence of God—all deny the right of choice and preference, of the natural as well as the Christian liberty, and make labor in itself an absolute duty in view of the divine will.

This view is substantiated by the numerous examples of industry and innate energy to work in the brute crea-

tion, all which condemn idleness and indolence in man as traits contrary to nature and to the intention of God. "Go to the ant, thou sluggard, consider her ways and be wise. Which having no guide, overseer or ruler, provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest. How long wilt thou sleep, O sluggard, when wilt thou arise out of thy sleep? So shall thy poverty come as one that traveleth, and thy want as an armed man. Prov. 6, 6–11. And our Lord unmistakably means to convey this truth in the parable of the servants and the talents, Matt. 25, 14–28, where the disregard of the master's command to employ these talents "according to his several ability," in the last case calls down upon the "slothful servant" a terrible rebuke for neglecting to labor, not in his own behalf, but in the interest of his master, not of necessity for his own advantage, but because of his duty to invest the talent entrusted to his keeping.

A second object, however, of labor must be stated, which the Lord clearly indicates in the creation of a help meet for man. The divine injunction to work bears a double relation, to the Creator and to the creature. It should not only serve to glorify God in obedience, but be the means of mutual benefit and blessing to all, whose relation is that of common dependency on the Lord's mercies. Labor therefore is not solely subject to the law of command, but likewise to the law of love and charity—in truth, the former can be consistently regarded only in so far as it finds its practical application in the fulfillment of its object in the latter. The summary of the second table of the law "Love thy neighbor as thyself," whilst based upon the first table: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength" is equally binding, and cannot be practically neglected without reducing the obedience to the first table to a mere service of hypocrisy. It is impossible to refuse to render service according to our talents and opportunities to our neighbor, whether from a disposition of selfishness or idleness or even unconcern, and at the same time be in har-

mony with the spirit of the law and observant of our duty towards God. The two duties are so inseparable, that Christ designates all deeds of charity to the least of His brethren, as done unto Him. Matt. 25, 40.

If now these are the characteristic objects of labor as enjoined upon man in his pure and sinless state, though the nature and sphere of labor may be changed by the fall and its concomitants, the general object must remain the same, being subject to the same immutable will of the Creator and the application of the same intellectual and physical powers, though weakened and lethargic, and exercised in the same relation to our fellow-men. We therefore find the command to work reiterated immediately after the fall, Gen. 3. 17–19: "And unto Adam He said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." And v. 23: "Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken." Before the fall man found pleasure in obeying, and joy and satisfaction in executing the work allotted to him in Eden. After the fall the same labor assumed the nature of an absolute necessity for the maintenance of his life and the satisfaction of his wants on the one hand, and the character of a severe burden and oppressive and exhausting toil and bitter disappointment and reverses on the other. The element of necessity enters through the disturbed relation between God and man, the former insisting on the fulfillment of His just command and the proper appreciation of the gracious endowments, with which He had fitted out man; the latter in his condition of slavery to sin, his heart hostile and in open rebellion against the Lord's will, ever prone to slight that command and refuse obedience. The ground therefore is accursed, thistle

and thorns the sole yield of its impaired fertility, and the nakedness of man a constant source of care, wherewith it shall be clothed. Man *must* labor in harmony with the divine command and in opposition to his natural inclination, if he would not perish. 2 Thess. 3, 10. 12: "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any one would not work, neither should he eat." "Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work and eat their own bread."

Furthermore in the economy of the world the second object which we have noted retains its full obligatory force over against our fellow-men, since in our sinful condition more than ever our multiplied necessities call for mutual co-operation and fraternal communication of individual gifts. As little as we can set aside the obligation of charity towards our brethren, as little as we can urge any special claim of righteousness or desert for a greater abundance of the blessings of this life over against the less fortunate of our race, all being alike under the curse of the just wrath of God; so little can we presume to withhold all or any part of our powers and gifts from the service of our neighbor. "Let him that stole, steal no more, but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give him that needeth." Eph. 4, 28. "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty, only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Col. 5, 13. 14. "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." Phil. 2, 4.

The first and chief causes which serve to make labor in our present condition irksome, distasteful, oppressive and harrowing must be sought in the same evil power of sin. Man's perfection is converted into a pitiful image of imperfection and corruption. Together with the disturbed relation of his own powers of mind and body, the utterly destroyed harmony with nature and its laws arouses a con-

tinuous conflict with himself and with the objects about him. The spoils of the earth must be wrested from its grasp at the expense of ingenuity and physical force, and the conversion of all materials into forms according to our wants requires endless resources, abilities and industry. In a thousand instances the result is not commensurate with the work, disappointment, dissatisfaction, hopelessness, despair result. Disability and disease enforce idleness, whilst the will chafes and the heart grows despondent with the dread of want and suffering. The wrath of insulted Majesty and rejected Love decrees the punishment on all creatures, that through chastisement they may be brought to acknowledgment of their guilt and led the way of repentance. Even in the heavy hand of God we recognize His divine love.

Starting out from these fundamental principles we can intelligently determine the only true and scriptural motives from which man should labor. The same incentives which lead men to do that which is good and acceptable before the Lord must be also the motives to labor in a manner pleasing to God. According to 1 Cor. 10, 31, "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God," the main-spring of all thoughts and deeds of a Christian must be the desire to praise God. This praise has its root in the obedience to God's command, which obedience in turn is the fruit of the love of God and of our neighbor, fashioned with us after the image of God, saved with us through the atoning blood of Christ, and united with us by the closest ties of brotherhood in our acceptance as children of God and co-heirs of His Son. That which is pleasing to God, must be in fullest conformity with His command and will; all labor, therefore, by which God shall be glorified, must spring from love, which is the fulfilling of the law. Rom. 13, 10.

On the other hand the conclusion is equally stringent, that whatever labor proceeds not from this single motive of obedience and love, which has not for its primary object the glory of God in subjection to His will, must be displeasing in His sight, and therefore—must be sinful. This truth is

an unfailing criterion for a Christian with which to test his work, and to determine his duty in all relations of life, both as employer and employe. It is laudable and well to be diligent and fond of work, whether the result of natural disposition or of judicious training. But the mere love of work will not make us pleasing to God in our diligence, where the higher motive of conscious service to God and our neighbor is not the motive and directive power. By the same rule all labor which has for its primary object the accumulation of wealth, from love of comforts and advantages which result therefrom, or from feelings of confidence and independence inspired by the possession of riches, must be classed as sin. Perhaps no other motive is so universally potent among men as that just mentioned, for it is the practical expression of that distrust in the watchful care and providence of God, which is the natural consequence of our aversion to do the will of the Creator, and of the resultant antagonism to dependence upon His mercies. Hence we find men as a rule laboring diligently with the utmost exertion of all their powers, and striving with all possible ingenuity to gain, one from the other, that which they consider the rock of their hope and trust. We need not seek further, then, for an explanation of that discontent with their lot, that distaste for their avocation, that spirit of jealousy against the more successful and wealthy, that violence which by right of force would deprive others of their legitimate possessions, when honest labor and industry were not successful in furnishing more than the daily bread. Where no feeling of common dependency upon a gracious supreme Ruler actuates man to labor from a sense, not only of necessity, but of common duty and mutual love, recognizing a stewardship in the investment of their several talents, of which reckoning must be made, such phenomena of selfish assumption of judgement and arrogation of discretionary power to dictate terms which shall prove binding upon others in the discharge of their duty, cannot present serious difficulties for solution in the light of God's word.

In like manner all work from motives of ambition only

must be stigmatized as sinful. Under the providential direction of God the results of such labor, for instance, in the sphere of science, letters and art may prove beneficial to mankind at large; but the fact, that evil is turned to blessing is but a shallow excuse for the commission of the sin, and does not change its moral character. In short, in distinction from the un-Christian, unconverted laborer, the true child of God will place all his gifts and talents, time and strength in the service of God through the means of his calling, whereto the Lord has called him. He recognizes the obligation to labor as the expression of the master's will. He applies the proceeds according to the law of love, first in supplying the wants of his family, who are made dependent upon him by the order of God; in helping along the affairs of his neighbor, whether rich or poor, as a brother in Christ; in alleviating the sufferings of the needy and making glad the hearts of the poor; in returning also to the treasury of the Lord a fair percentage of all gain according to his faith. This he does cheerfully, knowing that not the expenditure of muscle or brain force has yielded such ample returns, but the blessing of God, who gives the profit and increase.

Were men in general more careful to examine their motives to work and more conscientious to heed the irrefutable doctrines of Scriptures in this question, it would lead to the discontinuance of many evil habits and pernicious practices, which eventually must destroy the nobility of labor, and reduce it to the handmaid of selfishness and sordid desires. The vast resources and manifold blessings of our land and its free institutions, the marvelous growth of its industries and development of its natural wealth, have been especially active in producing a trait of insatiability and greed for riches, which have caused the stamp of "a nation of money-makers" to be fixed upon our people. The "almighty dollar" has been emblazoned by both admirers and defamers of America as the central figure upon our national escutcheon. We deprecate this stigma upon our fair land in the broad sense of its application; but we

dare not deny, that this besetting sin of man in general, namely, to make gold his hope and fine gold his confidence, Job. 31, 24, has reached a morbid growth in our people. Even those who lay claim to Christian principles have become infected to an alarming degree by this cancerous disease, the unwholesome effects of which are evinced especially in two characteristic evils: the remarkable lack of wisdom displayed in choosing a profession, and the frivolous readiness in changing the calling once adopted. The obvious desire of our youth to make choice of such pursuits as demand least physical or mental exertion, and at the same time promise remunerative returns has become a growing evil of our times. The causes are two-fold. The first is no doubt the deplorable ignorance of the real and only enobling object of labor. Not the willing obedience to God and His expressed will, nor the impulse to apply whatever of talents we have to the service of our neighbor are recognized as fundamental motives for the exercise of our strength and abilities; hence preference is given to employment in which one can serve the natural indolence and selfish desires of the flesh to best advantage. The "golden trades" are discarded for "genteel clerkships," the "higher professions" and the like. The rugged physique and callous hands of the mechanic are a reproach in the eyes of the "elegant" and "nobby" idler of some office or store. The productive brain of the close student becomes an object of ridicule to the hollow cranium of the jobber and speculator. Little work and small pay, but idle hours and indulgence in "cheap vices" are the goal of such unfortunate drones in the hire of mankind, but too often the victims of the folly and misdirected infatuation of overindulgent parents. The second cause is found in the desire to gain wealth as rapidly as possible. Hence the choice of avocations is directed to such employments, as promise to make early and abundant returns. The moral character of such business, the bearing it has on the weal or woe of mankind, directly or indirectly, does not enter into the calculation of the profits. The means employed are not scrutinized in the searching light of God's Word, and conscience is a factor eliminated entirely from the example. The many pernicious concerns of our land bear witness to the truth of our assertion.

The same causes underlie that frequency of changes in the calling, which justly is branded as a blot on our charac-

ter. It is perfectly natural, that where the inordinate desire to accumulate wealth in a short time has become a ruling passion, the gradual steps to independence by honest labor are wearisome and unsatisfactory. A perfect chase after the delusive phantom is instituted, resulting most frequently in wrecking all the nobler qualities of the deluded votary at the shrine of mammon, a shiftless, vacillating and ever unsatisfied young old man. The instances are comparatively rare in our country, where the son by adopting the father's honest business and honest business principles, and following his example of moderation and economical mode of living, has continued to add little by little to the perhaps scant store of his ancestors, and in this manner has built upon a safe foundation a structure, which has housed generations of happy and contented beings. If the temptations of our surroundings are more manifold, the methods to counteract them must be the more potent. We seek in vain for a weapon from the armory of political economy, or from the store-house of heathen morals. The fruit of the *Spirit of God* alone is "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Gal. 5, 22, 23.

We are a high-living and a fast-living people. Money comparatively readily gained retains the same peculiarity to change possessionship with ease. It is argued in extenuation of the increased demands of the so-called middle class for personal requirements, that the higher plane of culture of the present time begets the necessity of more refined surroundings and a more costly mode of living. The argument, however, is delusive. If the unhealthy desire to imitate, at the risk of surpassing the income, the follies and extravagances of the financially more favored neighbor, in the foolish notion, that refinement finds its proper expression in more expensive clothing or gaudy decoration of the home, is regarded as the evidence of higher culture, the sooner we return to the alleged "barbarism" of our ancestors, the better. True culture can never become the means of encouraging wasteful sham, or of imperiling peace of mind and purity of conscience for the sake of external glitter. Highest culture not infrequently dwells under lonely roofs and amidst the cares for daily bread. Where the cultivation of the heart does not keep pace with that of the head; where the intellect is developed at the expense of the consciousness of our duties to God and our fellowmen; where "tastes" are refined, and "feeling" allowed to grow rank, the balance in our life is destroyed, and the

boasted culture is but the whitening of sepulchres. True culture finds expression in a higher degree of happiness, of satisfaction and of peace. These requisites, however, can result only from a more perfect harmony of our nature with itself and with the law of the Creator. A true love for the beautiful and good can emanate only from the divine source of perfection and of goodness, through the Spirit of God.

Finally the question may be considered, how much time should be devoted to labor, and what relation recreation should sustain to labor. The purpose in proposing the query cannot be to establish for all pursuits and all circumstances a limited number of hours, days, or years, which must be given to work. The nature of the employment, the capacity of the individual, his situation in life, and numberless considerations preclude the possibility of fixing a time schedule for all alike or for each case. The answer must be given on the broad ground of Scripture, which conceives labor as a service to God and man, and hence claims nothing more than a conscientious application to our duty, according to the measure of strength and ability, in our various callings. "As every man has received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God, if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth, that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, our Lord, to whom be praise and dominion forever and ever. Amen." 1 Pet. 4, 10. 11. God enjoins upon us simply diligence according to our ability. He forbids idleness and slothfulness, Rom. 12, 11. "Be not slothful in business; fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." He exhorts us to "redeem the time, because the days are evil," Eph. 5, 16, which means, that we should improve every moment conscientiously and with diligence, for the evil days will not be slow to entrap us into disobedience and follies, which are abhorred of the Lord. Idleness is the hot-bed of mischief and vices. Satan can nowhere find so congenial a soil, into which to sow the evil seeds of discontent, jealousy, hatred and violence, as where hands and thoughts are unemployed in some godly and charitable work. Unwilling to serve God in the love of our neighbor through our abilities in a legitimate business, we unconsciously sell ourselves into the slavery of the devil and the bonds of sin. As St. Paul writes: "And withal they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house, and not only idle, but tattlers and busy-bodies, speaking things which they ought not," 1 Tim. 5, 13. The great ptinciple

then, which we lay down as scriptural is this, that all the time which is allotted to us must be employed, either directly in our several avocations, or indirectly in the improvement and cultivation of ourselves, by which our talents and abilities are developed and re-enforced to become the more effective in ministering to our fellow-men. Even when after years of successful labor the accumulated wealth has lifted us above the necessity of laboring for our daily bread, we are still in that great service to our neighbor, from which nothing can exempt; we are still under that obligation which is established by the Creator, and which our common necessities make a duty of love.

In view of the fact, that we must devote our earthly life to labor, it follows very clearly, that recreation and rest are not the object of life, but the means to an end. In the imperfect condition of our nature since the fall of man, the powers of mind and body are limited and subject to weakness and exhaustion. In order that this waste of strength may be recuperated to enable us to fulfill our mission according to God's will, rest must be had, and is acceptable to God. We are "to make provision for the flesh," Rom. 13, 14, "but not to fulfill the lusts thereof." That our work may be profitable, we must husband our strength, and refresh our languid powers. In the degree, therefore, in which the nature of labor is exhausting and debilitating, recreation must be sought. The object to be attained will demonstrate the division of time and the nature of the relief.

The labor question has become a burning question of our times, and the problem in its practical bearings is yet far from being solved by so-called "scientific" methods. We are aware, that the principles laid down above will not meet with favor at the hands of our "reformers," nor be heeded by the masses who are not brought unto the knowledge of the truth through the gospel of Jesus Christ. But the imminent danger, that even conscientious Christians may be misled by the rantings of men, whose attempts to "better the lot of workingmen" are characterized by principles of grossest injustice and violence, which are condemned by God's word, and whose motives exhibit the very essence of selfishness, impose the duty to furnish our brethren with what light we can derive from the Spirit of God, that by avoiding the seductive ways of the ungodly, they may give diligence to make their calling sure unto which they are called in holiness and righteousness to the praise of God and the salvation of their souls. T. M.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME VI.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
THE LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN,
J. L. TRAUGER, Manager.
1886.

INDEX TO VOLUME VI.

No. I.

Page.

Lutheran Union, by Prof. M. Loy 1
The two Testaments in the one Revelation, by G. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 19
Paper Resolutions, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 32
The Treatment of the Oath in the Sermon, in Catechisation, etc., by Prof. A. Pflueger 47

No. II.

The Genesis of Faith, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 65
Lutheran Union, by Prof. M. Loy 89
The Treatment of the Oath in the Sermon, in Catechisation, etc., by Prof. A. Pflueger 106
Paradise found at last, by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn 115

No. III.

The Gift of Tongues, by Prof. Theo. Mees 129
The Genesis of Faith, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 147
The New Theory of the Old Testament, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 167
Luther on Questions of Divorce, Translated by Rev. J. A. Schulze 178

No. IV.

Lutheran Union, by Prof. M. Loy 193
The Office of Faith, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 217
Environment and Character, by Rev. E. Pfeifer 231
What the Roman Catholics want, by Prof. A. Pflueger 249

No. V.

What the Roman Catholics want, by Prof. A. Pflueger 257
The Constitution of Synods, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 267
Christmas and Easter Scenes in Jerusalem, Translated by Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 291
The Age of Man Geologically Considered, by S. R. Pattison, Esq., F. G. S. 302

No. VI.

The Mystery in Conversion, by Prof. M. Loy 321
Concerning Articles of Faith, by Prof. G. H. Schodde 349
Labor in the Light of the Bible, by Prof. Theo. Mees 372

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are $2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. C. H. L. Schuette, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. VI.

		Page.
1.	The Mystery in Conversion, by Prof. M. Loy	321
2.	Concerning Articles of Faith, by Prof. G. H. Schodde	340
3.	Labor in the Light of the Bible, by Prof. Theo. Mees	372

Monies Received for Volume VI.

Rev. W. J. Schroyer, Rev. M. Walter, Rev. E. L. S. Tressel, Rev. S. Braaten, Rev. L. F. Meyer, Rev. C. F. Brecht, each $2.00; Rev. L. M. Baum, $4.00; Rev. J. Doermann, $4.50; Rev. Th. Eich, $5.00; Rev. V. A. M. Mortensen, E. S. Holland, Rev. G. Cronenwett, each $6.00.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. VI.—No. VI.

DECEMBER, 1886.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1886.